



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

970 WRIT PETITION NO. 3591 OF 2026

MANIKUMARI APPARAO BATTULA

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. V.B. Dhage, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. V.M. Kagne, AGP for State

...

971 WRIT PETITION NO. 3634 OF 2026

ABHILASHA DIGAMBAR PACHPOR AND OTHERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. M.M. Patil (Beedkar), Advocate for petitioners

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, AGP for State

...

972 WRIT PETITION NO. 3640 OF 2026

SANTOSH SHESHRAO KASBE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. S.R. Kedar, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. A.M. Phule, AGP for State

...

973 WRIT PETITION NO. 3647 OF 2026

SUBHASH BHAGWAN GAIKWAD AND ANR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND ORS

...

Mr. S.R. Kedar, Advocate for petitioners

Mr. R.S. Wani, AGP for State

Mr. M.B. Kolpe, Advocate for respondent No.3

...

974 WRIT PETITION NO. 3655 OF 2026

SACHIN BALASAHEB POUL ALIES PAUL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. THE SECRETARY GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION DEPT. AN ORS

...

Mr. D.M. Shinde, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S.B. Narwade, AGP for State

Mr. M.B. Kolpe, Advocate for respondent No.3

...

WRIT PETITION NO.3718 OF 2026

MANGESH NARAYANRAO WAGHMARE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. P.S. Anerao, Advocate h/f Mr. Ajinkya Reddy, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S.K. Tambe, AGP for State

Mr. M.B. Kolpe, Advocate for respondent No.3

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 09th APRIL, 2026

ORDER :

. Heard learned Advocates for respective petitioners. These petitions had come up before us yesterday and after hearing the petitioners for some time we thought it fit that the opportunity should be given to the State as well as to the respondent – MPSC to represent themselves. Accordingly, the matters were placed today. Learned AGPs appearing for State in respective matters at the outset informed that similarly situated candidates for same relief had approached the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal by way of raising challenge to the impugned Notification itself and after hearing in detail the original application filed by the said candidates has been rejected. They further submit that by way of raising challenge to the

order passed by the learned Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal a petition has already been filed in this Court and was mentioned before the coordinate Bench, who has placed the hearing of the said petition tomorrow.

2 Learned Advocates appearing for the respective petitioners in all the petitions therefore seek liberty to withdraw the petitions.

3 As the matter has already been considered in detail by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal and the order has already been passed, we do not proceed to adjudicate the issue of the present petitioners, who had directly approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The permission to withdraw the petitions is therefore granted. All the writ petitions stand **dismissed** as withdrawn.

4 We make it clear that the petitions will not be adjudicated on merits.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)