IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION IN WRIT PETITION NO. 122 OF 2026

Gaurav Balu Darade and Ors Petitioners

versus

Chetan Bhalerao Borase and Ors Respondents

Mr. Yatin Malvankar, Advocate, for Petitioners.

Mr. Kedar B. Dighe, Advocate, for Respondent No. 3/PCMC.

Mr. Aditya R. Deolekar, AGP, for State.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
AARTI SATHE, JJ.

DATE: 1st OCTOBER 2026

P.C.

1. This Review Petition is filed by Original Respondent No. 4 praying for the review in order dated 6th August 2026 passed by this Court in the aforesaid Writ Petition. The Writ Petition was disposed of by this Court in terms of the following order:

> ORDER
>
> (i) The decision of Selection Committee of Respondent No.3-PCMC dated 13th January 2025 refusing to grant appointment to the Petitioner is upheld;
>
> (ii) Consequently, as fairly submitted on behalf of the PCMC, the other 13 appointments who are similarly placed as the Petitioner are not being recognized by the PCMC which are also being held to be illegal. Respondent No.3-PCMC is at liberty to take appropriate steps in respect of termination of services of Respondent Nos.4 to 13 as the law would mandate;
>
> (iii) The writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

2. The case of the Review Petitioner is that the Petitioner was not heard by this Court when the aforesaid order was passed. It is contended that considering the observations made by this Court, the services of the Petitioners, who are stated to be on probation, are likely to be terminated.

3. We may observe that, in the course of adjudication of the said proceedings, we had recorded the stand taken on behalf of Respondent No.3/PCMC in paragraph 23 of the said order, to the effect that, considering that there are 13 other candidates who have been employed and have certificates from the institution AIILSG, which did not have any authority to conduct the course, the services of such 13 candidates who have certificates from an unauthorized institution would be required to be terminated by stating nothing to them, further instructions would be issued to take appropriate action in respect of their employment. The observations as made in Paragraph 23 are required to be noted which read thus:

> "23. **Learned counsel on behalf of Respondent No.3-PCMC has also made a statement that considering that the 13 other candidates who have been employed and have certificates from AIILSG which is not an approved and recognized institute, their services would be terminated and further notices would be issued to them to take appropriate action in respect of their employment.** Considering the above categorical submission by learned counsel on behalf of Respondent No.3-PCMC and the facts and law, we are also of the view that considering that even the Marathwada Board does not have the requisite approval, the Petitioner would not stand a chance to gain employment in Respondent No.3-PCMC, on the strength of the certificate obtained from the Marathwada Board, which is not an approved/recognized institution by the Competent Authority."
>
> **(emphasis supplied)**

4. The apprehension of the Review-Petitioner that his termination is likely to be made on the ground that the basic qualification of the course of Sanitary Inspector as obtained by the Review-Petitioner, from an institution which

was not a recognized/approved institution would cause prejudice to him, hence the order in question be recalled.

5. We do not agree with the Review-Petitioner. We find from what has been recorded in paragraph 23 (supra) of the order under review and the operative portion, that any action which is to be taken against the candidates who do not have qualification conferred by an institutions, recognized by law would be taken by Respondent No. 3 would be in accordance with law. The Review-Petitioner would insist that, insofar as the certificate obtained by him is concerned, qualification as obtained by him nonetheless needs to be held have been obtained from a recognized institution. In our opinion this assertion of the Review-Petitioner certainly would be taken into consideration before any action is taken.

6. Mr. Dighe, learned counsel on behalf of the Respondent No. 3/PCMC, submits that all the materials which may be relied upon by the Review-Petitioner shall be considered before final orders are passed in the case of Review-Petition.

7. In this view of the matter, we are not inclined to exercise the review jurisdiction, as we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record.

8. The rights of the Petitioners, if any, are certainly recognized which will be considered by the PCMC in passing any order.

9. Review Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

(AARTI SATHE, J.) (G.S.KULKARNI, J.)

Bharati