



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

WRIT PETITION NO.1651 OF 2026

DR. VINOD VISHNUJI MADAVI

VS

STATE OF MAHA., THR. PRINCIPAL SECY., PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
MUMBAI AND ORS.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. V.S. Undre, Advocate for the petitioner/s
Mr. I.J. Damle, AGP for the respondent/State
Mr. N.A. Gaikawad, Advocate for the respondent no.4.

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

DATE : 16.04.2026

1. Heard.
2. The petitioner has approached this Court with a grievance that for the admission in PG Courses in Medical Science, the petitioner has not been allotted incentives marks for which he is entitled as he worked for about eight years in Taluka : Korchi, District : Gadchiroli.
3. According to the petitioner, Taluka : Korchi in District : Gadchiroli, falls in remote area and thus, in view of the Government Resolution (GR) dated 19.03.2019, he is entitled to get incentive marks which should be included in the marks obtained by the petitioner in NEET PG examination.
4. In light of the above referred grievance of the petitioner, we perused the GR dated 19.03.2019 and

according to the said GR, the entitlement to get incentive marks is only in respect of the Primary Health Centres (PHCs) mentioned in the Annexure A1, A2, A3, B1, and B2.

5. Admittedly, Taluka : Korchi falls in Annexure A1 (List of remote PHC). It is at serial No.68. However, all the PHCs of Korchi Taluka are not included, but the said benefit is applicable to the person who worked for three years in Kodgul PHC only, which is in Taluka : Korchi, District : Gadchiroli.

6. It is also submitted that the petitioner worked for certain period in Kodgul PHC, but there is no document to show that the petitioner worked in Kodgul PHC for three years.

7. Botekasa PHC, Taluka Korchi, District Gadchiroli has been included in the list at Annexure A-3. However, as the condition is to work for three years in such rural place, the petitioner has again failed to point out any material or document to show that he worked at Botekasa PHC for three years.

8. In the petition, there are no pleadings giving details about both the places or the period for which the petitioner worked at the above-referred places, i.e., Kodgul and Botekasa, Taluka Korchi, District Gadchiroli. Thus, in the absence of sufficient material on record and necessary

3/3

pleadings in the petition to establish the petitioner's entitlement, we are not inclined to entertain the petition or grant the reliefs as prayed for.

Accordingly, the petition is **dismissed**.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)