

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 10228 OF 2010

Pranavkumar Pramodsingh Thakur .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri. P. B. Patil, Advocate for Petitioner.

Shri. S. P. Sonpawale, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Shri. D. S. Bagul, Advocate for Respondent No. 4.

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA AND

S. M. GAVHANE, JJ.

DATED : 29th September, 2018

PER COURT:

. Mr. Patil, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was admitted in the year 2004-2005 for the course of B. Pharmacy. He completed his degree course in the year 2008 with first class from private unaided institution. The learned counsel submits that under the Government Resolution dated 09.02.2007, the government took a policy decision to reimburse 50% fees to E.B.C. students from the

academic year 2006-2007. The petitioner is entitled for reimbursement of fees for the academic year 2006-2007, 2007-2008. The ground for rejection is that the petitioner has not taken admission through centralized admission process is erroneous. The scheme as introduced under G. R nowhere contemplates the same.

2. The learned A.G.P. submits that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of scheme, as the petitioner is admitted in the year 2004-2005 and secondly he has been admitted at a institute level.

3. We have considered the submissions.

4. The scheme dated 09.02.2007 is applicable to those students who have taken admission in the year 2006-2007 to the courses enumerated therein, they would be given benefit till completion of the course. The petitioner was admitted in the year 2004-2005. The said scheme is not meant for those students.

5. Be that as it may, the Government Resolution dated 10.12.2007 further clarifies the scheme introduced under the Government Resolution dated 09.02.2007 is applicable to those admitted through centralized

admission process. The petitioner is admitted at institution level. On this ground the petitioner is also not entitled.

6. In view of that, the writ petition is dismissed. Rule discharged. No costs.

[S. M. GAVHANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

ass/wp 10228.10