

{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

926 WRIT PETITION NO. 3691 OF 2026

Vijay Natthu Mahajan

VERSUS

State Of Maharashtra

Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Industry, Energy,

.....

Mr. Madhav M. Bhokarikar, Advocate for the Petitioner

Ms. Neha B. Kamble, AGP for Respondent No.1-State

.....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 08 APRIL, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner;
2. The present petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

“b. The declaration of result by respondent no. 2, Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company, of Employment Advertisement no. 07/2024 dated 22.6.2024 as (सेवायोजन जाहिरात क्रमांक ०७ / २०२४) resulted in rejecting claim of petitioner may kindly be quashed and set aside, with further direction that respondent no. 2, Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company shall recalculate, reevaluate marks of petitioner, strictly as per its Employment Advertisement no. 7/2024 dated 22.6.2024, with different circulars, letters of respondents and policy of Government, with experience of petitioner.

c. The petitioner may kindly be declared and be treated as permanent employee of respondent no. 2, Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company, with further direction to give all benefits, including Pay-Scale and arrears of salary from date, after completion of his probation period as his apprenticeship.”

{2}

3. The learned advocate for the petitioner points out various Government Resolutions as well as circulars issued by respondents No. 2 and 3, stipulating certain remarks to be given to candidates from the project-affected category. The petitioner relies upon the certificate issued in his name on 20.05.2021 by the District Rehabilitation Officer, declaring him to be a project-affected person. Thereafter, the petitioner came to be appointed for training specifically carved out for project-affected persons. The said appointment letter is dated 11.04.2022. According to the petitioner, he was entitled to receive 25 marks as per the Administrative Circular dated 29.09.2017 (Clause B1). He thereafter applied for the post of Senior Technician pursuant to Advertisement No. 7/2024 dated 22.06.2024. It is further contended that respondents No. 2 and 3 are also not considering him as a permanent employee, even though he is still working with them, and therefore the present petition has been filed.

4. Upon a query as to when the results were declared, the learned advocate for the petitioner stated that the results were declared on 27.01.2025. This submission is made in view of paragraph No. 13.18, wherein it has been stated “भरती प्रक्रियेस विलंब होणे, परिक्षा पुर्णपणे रद्द होणे अथवा निवड प्रक्रिया पूर्ण करण्यात अडचणी येणे याबाबतची शक्यता नाकारता येत नाही. अशा परिस्थितीत परिक्षा वेळेवर पार पाडण्याचे/परिक्षा पुन्हा सुरु करण्याचे/निवड प्रक्रिया पुर्ण करण्याचे सर्व प्रयत्न करण्यात येतील. तथापि आवश्यकता भासल्यास पुन्हा

{3}

ऑनलाईन परिक्षा देखील घेतली जावू शकते. याबाबत कंपनी प्रशासनाचा निर्णय अंतिम राहिल याची उमेदवारांनी नोंद घ्यावी.”

5. Upon query, learned advocate for the petitioner submits that at least the prayer clause ‘B’ be considered.

6. Here, it is to be noted that the writ petition has been filed on 02.02.2026. It will have to be considered, upon a response from respondents No. 2 and 3, as to whether they are treating the said selection list as lapsed in view of paragraph No. 13.18 of Advertisement No. 7/2024. Hence, issue notice to respondents. Learned AGP waives service of notice for respondent No.1-State.

7. Notice of respondents No.2 and 3 is made returnable on 06.05.2026.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

S P Rane