



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,  
NAGPUR BENCH, AT NAGPUR.**

**WRIT PETITION NO.4976 OF 2025**

Shri Kamalkishor Narendra Dhekane, At & Post Tamsi, Tq. & Dist. Washim

vs.

State of Maharashtra, Thr. Secretary of Home Dept. Mumbai and ors.

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

Court's or Judge's orders  
-----

Shri Vijaykumar Paliwal, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms Tajwar Khan, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

Shri R. N. Ghuge, Advocate for respondent No.5.

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.**

**DATED : 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2026**

The present petition raises a challenge to the judgment dated 25/03/2025 passed by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal dismissing the O.A. No.1202/2022 filed by the petitioner raising a challenge to the appointment of respondent No.5 on the post of Police Constable in S.B.C. category.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that though respondent No.5 had applied in open category and the petitioner in S.B.C. category, respondent No.5 has been granted appointment in S.B.C category, whereas the petitioner has been denied.

The claim of the petitioner that respondent No.5 never applied in S.B.C category is based on the information received by him under the Right to Information Act i.e. the list of candidates who had applied in S.B.C. category wherein the name of respondent No.5 is not mentioned. However, the respondent-State has pointed out that the said information is incorrect and further produced the documents showing that the respondent No.5 had applied in S.B.C. category. On satisfaction that respondent No.5 had applied in S.B.C. category, the Tribunal observed that the information received by the petitioner

under the Right to Information Act was incorrect.

3. In that view of the matter, since record shows that respondent No.5 had applied in S.B.C. category, challenge to the appointment of respondent No.5 goes. Furthermore, it is evident that the recruitment process in question is of 2013. Thereafter on many occasions, recruitment process was carried on. It is the case of the petitioner that he was pursuing the matter and on receiving the information under the Right to Information Act, O.A. came to be filed after nine years.

4. The fact remains that the recruitment process in question is of 2013 and application under Right to Information Act was first time made after nine years in 2022. Therefore, it is difficult to accept the contention of the petitioner that he was pursuing the matter.

5. In that view of the matter, we do not inclined to interfere in the order impugned. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

(Raj D. Wakode, J.)

(Anil S. Kilor, J.)