



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1188 OF 2026

Ravi Shrirang Jadhav And Others
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

Mr. M. L. Muthal, Advocate for petitioners
Mr. A. B. Girase, GP for respondent-State

**CORAM : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &
Hiten S. Venegavkar, JJ.**

DATE : 18th March, 2026

ORDER (PER : Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.):-

1. Present petition challenges the proceedings relating to the recruitment process for the post of Technician III conducted by the Maharashtra State Power Generation Company Ltd. (MAHAGENCO) pursuant to Advertisement No. 04/2024. The petition also challenges the results that has been published on 24.10.2025 and the selection list/merit list based thereon in so far as they are found to be illegal, arbitrary, and violative of the principles of natural justice, fairness and constitutional mandates. The petitioners further seeks direction to the respondent No. 2 to stay, halt or suspend the ongoing recruitment process for the post of Technician III and further directions to the respondents to immediately publish the complete merit list containing original marks and scores of all the candidates who appeared for the

examination. One more challenge that has been raised in the present petition pertains to the reservation policies, rules and regulations not been followed by the respondents while proceeding with the selection process in pursuance of the advertisement No. 04/2024 and according to the petitioners, the reservation policies, reserve limits are exceeded.

2. The petitioners states that respondent No. 2 has issued an advertisement No. 04/2024 inviting applications for the post of Technician III from the persons belonging to the different categories. The advertisement was for total 800 posts and as the petitioners were eligible to participate in the said selection process had submitted their application forms along with the details of their eligibility criteria. The online examination was conducted by the institute of Banking personnel on behalf of respondent No. 2 in the month of May, 2025 i.e., from 08.05.2025 till 10.05.2025 and on 15.05.2025. The results of the examination was announced on 24.10.2025 and the list of candidates who were shortlisted were published by the respondents. The shortlisted candidates were called for document verification and according to the petitioners, the said process is still ongoing.

3. It is the case of the petitioners that the result published by the respondent authorities on 24.10.2025. It suffers from several

irregularities in the recruitment process. After the publication of the result, the petitioners submitted several representations to the authorities raising their concerns, grievances and pointing out the irregularities in the result, but authorities have not taken any of the representation submitted by the petitioners till date. The petitioners argues that the regular process that has been adopted by respondent No. 2 since last seven years while conducting the examinations and selecting candidates in the selection process, the said process of publishing separate merit list, select list and then waiting list has not been followed. Though the advertisement clearly mentions that the appointments are through direct service recruitment, yet the direct service recruitment rules have not been followed and they have been violated by selecting two candidates for one seat in the selection board. It is the case of the petitioners that even the reservation policy adopted for the post of woman candidate has been availed by the candidate of another category and thus, according to the petitioners, is in gross violation of the rules of reservation. It is further case of the petitioners that in the impugned advertisement process, there are two groups of the candidates who have submitted their forms to the Mahanirmit Company to set up a project, a total 1400 candidates for one to 5 years of training period and total 400 candidates for 1 to 4 training period and thus, by giving equal seats for both the groups, the Mahanirmit Advertisement

No. 04/2024 has in fact, cause injustice to the project affected candidates. He further submits that during the previous recruitment, which were conducted by the respondents since 2010 till 2019, the groups were never formed in the aforesaid manner and therefore, it is necessary that the respondents be directed to follow the said recruitment process even during the advertisement No. 04/2024. The post which were reserved for the retired Indian Army Solders has also been filled by the candidates who are not belonging from the army background and even the general candidates have been considered for the said post. The petitioners further argues that no publication of the merit list contending the original marks allotted to the candidates violates the principle of transparency and amounts to arbitrary and biased decision process which directly effects the entire selection process. Even the advertisement procedure which was required to be completed within a period of 45 days from the date of conducting the examination has been unduly non complied with and the results have been belatedly declared and published on 24.10.2025 which is beyond 45 days herein.

4. We have heard learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners and he has reiterated all the grounds that has been prays in the present petition. We have also perused the documents that has been placed on record by the petitioners. First and the foremost important fact

that is required to be noticed is that the petitioners after participating in the entire selection process and only after noticing their name does not appear in the select list have chosen to raise their grievance pertaining to the process followed by the respondents while executing the advertisement and also in respect of deficiencies pertaining to the select list as well as maintaining the reservation in the said advertisement. Secondly, the select list which has been annexed at Exhibit 'D' on Page No. 50 is the list which publishes the names of the candidates for the purpose of submitting their documents for verification without mentioning any score or marks they have obtained. Thus, the list only gives description of those candidates who have been chosen for submitting the document verification. It is not the case of the petitioners that apart from submitting a representation, they have made any statutory attempt of submitting an application under the Right to Information Act to obtain the details of the marks that they have obtained in the said examination. In absence of this, it cannot be said that the petitioners approached this Court with bona fide intention of raising a grievance, despite the fact that they have sufficient marks to be qualified, yet were ignored or their names were not shown in the list that has been published on 24.10.2025 by the respondent authorities. The another ground that has been raised and canvased by the petitioners pertaining to the reservation being not followed in respect of the woman

candidate and the candidates belonging to the ex-serviceman category. According to us, when the process is only in respect of document verification which has been now opted by the department, it is too premature for us to adjudicate that the department will not follow the reservation criteria that has been mentioned by them in the advertisement.

5. Thus, the petitioners have not made out any case to interfere with the selection process that has been adopted by the respondents. The petition, therefore, lacks any merit and, hence, stands dismissed. No orders as to costs.

(Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.)

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)

B. S. Joshi