



N THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 7762 OF 2025

Dnyaneshwari D/o. Appasaheb Nagare

Vs.

The Maharashtra Animal and Fishery Sciences University & Ors.

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
Appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's order

Mr. R.B. Dhore, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. K.A. Patil, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Mr. N.A. Gaikwad, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

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

DATE : 06.05.2026

Heard.

2. The admission of respondent No.4 in the Maharashtra Animal and Fishery Sciences University is under challenge by way of this petition on the ground that, despite there being a condition to submit all original documents at the time of spot admission, respondent No.4 was not possessing such documents, but only on the basis of bona fide certificate, admission was granted. Subsequently, all other documents were submitted by respondent No.4, contrary to the Rules.

3. It is submitted that the Rule permitting to submit bona fide certificate to the extent that if the student is already admitted in some other college, such condition was in respect of leaving certificate and not in respect of other documents. It is further submitted that the other documents were not submitted at the relevant time and, therefore, the admission itself is illegal.

It is also contended that the fees were not paid on the date of spot admission.

4. In reply, Mr. Patil, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3, makes a statement that, in the merit list, the respondent No.4 was at Serial No.5 and the petitioner was at Serial No.16, and in between the petitioner and respondent No.4, there were three more candidates. It is, therefore, submitted that even if this petition is entertained and the admission of respondent No.4 is disturbed, the petitioner cannot be granted admission. Moreover, he submits that the course commenced in the month of September 2025 and now almost 70% of the course is completed.

5. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3, and more particularly the statement that there were three more meritorious candidates between the petitioner and respondent No.4, and further considering that almost 70% of the course is already completed, at this stage, we are not inclined to exercise discretionary powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to disturb the admission already granted to respondent No.4.

6. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. No costs.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)