



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 723 OF 2024

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 6221 OF 2019 (D)

RAJU S/O. GANPAT GEDAM AND ANOTHER

Vs.

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, THROUGH ITS SECRETARY, RURAL DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT, MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI AND ANOTHER

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. N. S. Warulkar, Counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. H. D. Futane, AGP for the respondent/State.
Mr. V. M. Kulsange, Counsel for the respondent no. 2.

**CORAM : SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATED : 09.01.2026

1. The judgment under review is passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No. 6221/2019. The same is sought to be reviewed on the ground that there is an error apparent on the face of record since the petitioners were eligible even though in the year 2018 and the earlier round of litigation the co-ordinate Bench of this Court has directed to consider the representations. Reliance is placed on order of this Court passed in Writ Petition No. 439 of 2019 to contend that this Court has directed to decide the intervention between the period of two weeks from today.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant seeking review states that the fact that the petitioners were eligible in year 2018 i.e. they have not attended the age of 45 years

and the true purport of sub-Rule 2 Rule 2-A of Maharashtra Zilla Parishad Services (Recruitment) Rules, 2005 has not been considered and therefore there is an averment on the face of record.

3. Considered the contentions canvassed by the learned counsel for the petitioners and having gone through the judgment impugned. The said judgment records a finding that the fact that when the recruitment was initiated, the petitioners were eligible and therefore, there is no question of giving advantage to them as per sub-Rule 2 Rule 2-A of the Rules supra. Furthermore, this Court has also recorded a finding that there is no mandate to annually undertake the recruitment.

5. In that view of the matter, there is no error apparent on the face of record and review is not maintainable and rejected.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

(SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND, J.)