IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

. of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	<u>O.A. No.943 of 2</u>	<u>016</u>
	Dr. C.G. Gaikwad Vs.	Applicant
	The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	Respondents
	Heard Shri A.J. Chougule, lea for the Respondents.	arned Presenting Officer
	2. The matter was called out at Advocate for the Applicant Shri B.A present. Therefore, Ld. PO was asked	A. Bandiwadekar, is not
	3. Heard arguments of Ld. PO.	
	4. Shri Govind Bhise, Section Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai is	Officer, Public Health present in the Court.
	5. Later on at the request of applicant adjourned to 13.2.2023.	Ld. Advocate for the
	Member (A) C	Sd/- lla Bhatkar, J.) hairperson 5.2.2023

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

 $\frac{1}{1}$

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023
	O.A.No.12 of 2023
	J. M. KawadeApplicant
	Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	 Heard Shri G. A. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. Today, learned P.O. has filed reply on behalf of the
	Respondent. It is taken on record.
	The matter is adjourned for hearing at the stage of
	dmission.
	S.O. to 07.02.2023.
	n Sd/-
v	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

 Versus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespond Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate fo Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Prese Officer for the Respondents. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commiss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Ricommittee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. 4. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the questive placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a	Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
 D.J. PawarApplicativersus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespond 1. Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate for Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Prese Officer for the Respondents. 2. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission 3. The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commiss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Teather He weeker, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by RC committee to that extent only the Applicant has flip present O.A. 4. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the questitiplacing the matter before Review Committee matterioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		Date: 06.02.2023
 Versus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespond Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate fo Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Prese Officer for the Respondents. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commiss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Ricommittee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the questive placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		O.A. No.149 of 2023
 Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate fo Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Prese Officer for the Respondents. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commiss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Re Committee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the questin placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		
 Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Prese Officer for the Respondents. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commiss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Re Committee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the question placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
 The Applicant was serving as Graduate Pri Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commisss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Re Committee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the question placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting
 Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03. in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been comp and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commisss for Tribal Development Department, Thane by dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imp punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Tea However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 s that the decision of reinstatement would be finally only after review of the Suspension by Re Committee to that extent only the Applicant has fil present O.A. 4. Obviously once D.E. is concluded punishment of reversion is imposed the question placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a 		2. O.A. is disposed of at the stage of admission.
punishment of reversion is imposed the question placing the matter before Review Committee mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarr and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subject punishment Departmental proceeding comes to a		Teacher. He was suspended by order dated 05.03.2020 in contemplation of D.E. Later D.E. has been completed and Respondent No.2 – The Additional Commissioner for Tribal Development Department, Thane by order dated 13.01.2023 (Pg.72 & 73 of P.B.) imposed punishment of reversion to the post of Primary Teacher. However, at the end of order Respondent No.2 stated that the decision of reinstatement would be taken finally only after review of the Suspension by Review Committee to that extent only the Applicant has file the
posting without prejudice to the Applicant rig appeal. The question of taking review and postp		punishment of reversion is imposed the question of placing the matter before Review Committee as mentioned by Respondent No.2 is totally unwarranted and impermissible. Once the Applicant is subjected to punishment Departmental proceeding comes to an end and in terms of punishment order he needs to be given posting without prejudice to the Applicant right to appeal. The question of taking review and postponing issuance of the order of posting on reversion does not

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
•	5. O.A. is disposed of by giving following directions
	 A) Respondent No.2 is required to issue order of posting on reverted post of Primar Health Teacher and it cannot be kept in abeyance.
	B) In view of above, Respondent No.2 directed to pass appropriate order of postin on reverted post of Primary Teacher withi two weeks from today.
	C) No order as to costs.
	် Sd/-
	(A.P. Kurhekar)
	Member (J)
	NMN

(G.C.P.) J 2959 (A) (50,000–3-2017)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

MUMBAI				
Original Application No.	of 20		DISTRICT	Applicant/s
(Advocate)			
	versus	3		
The St		shtra and others		
				Respondent/s
(Presenting Officer)		-
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Corar Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	n,	Tribunal	's orders	
•		<u>0.A.10</u>	013/2022	
		1. Dhekale Vs.	App	licant
		te of Mah. & ors.	Respo	ndents
		Speaking to Mi	inutes	
	Applican	Heard Shri M.D. Lo It and Smt. A.B. Kol Respondents.		
	Minutes mistakes	The matter is taken of to correct certa in the order date in O.A.1013/2022.	in typogra ed 31.01.20	phical inadvertent
	No.A-4/1 is at Pag 15.12.20	ndeed, Applicant's o 1 on 15.02.2018 as ge No.29 of P.B. Ho 018 in Para Nos.2 as .2018 in place of 15	seen from S owever, the nd 3. It ne	Station Diary which date is recorded as
· · ·	that Wi 13.04.20 it stands	econdly, In Para M rit Petition No.13 22. Whereas, as pe s disposed of thoug ed'be substituted as	1/2020 w er order of H gh effect the	as dismissed on Ion'ble High Court, e same. The word
	O.A.732, wrongly	hirdly, Tribunal in /2017 decided the r mentioned in Para l as 26.02.2019.	natter on 26	5.02.2019, but it i
		n view of above, new ment dated 31.01.2		rection be made in
			Sd/	'-
			(A.P. Kurl Membe 06.02.2	r-J
,	(skw)			

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.147 OF 2023

Shri Madhukant Vinayakrao Garad,).. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

) ...Respondents

Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

CORAM : A.P. KURHEKAR, MEMBER(J)

DATE : 06.02.2023.

<u>ORDER</u>

1) Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondent.

2) The Applicant has challenged dated 02.02.2023 whereby he is transferred from the post of Secretary Cum Administrator, APMC, Pune to Deputy Director of Marketing, Directorate Pune on vacant post and also challenged order dated 02.02.2023 whereby Respondent No.2 was posted in his place.

3) Learned Advocate for the Applicant prayed for interim relief *interalia* contending that impugned transferred order dated 02.02.2023 is mid-term and mid-tenure and only to favour Respondent No.2 the Applicant is displaced. He placed reliance on decision of Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No.8177 of 2011 (Ramakant B. Kendre v/s. State of Maharashtra & Anr.) decided on 18.10.2011.

4) Per Contra, learned P.O. opposed the interim relief stating that transfer is recommended by Civil Service Board (CSB) and approved by competent authority i.e. Hon'ble Chief Minister. She therefore submits that post of Deputy Director of Marketing, Directorate Pune was lying vacant, and therefore exercising powers under Rule 4 proviso (i) the Applicant is transferred with due process of law.

5) Undisputedly, the Applicant was posted as Secretary Cum Administrator, APMC, Pune by order dated 19.03.2021 and has not completed three years normal tenure in terms of Section 4(1) of Transfer Act, 2005. Notably, Respondent No.2 who is posted in place of the Applicant was also not due for transfer. Indeed, perusal of record reveals that he was posted as Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Headquarter, Pune by order dated 20.10.2022. Pertinent to note, he did not joined at that post as clearly seen from file noting. There is also reference of order dated 20.10.2022 in the impugned order dated 02.02.2023. Thus, there is substance in the submission advanced by learned Advocate for the Applicant that all this exercise was done only to accommodate Respondent No.2.

6) Only because competent authority has approved the Transfer without *ipso-facto* would not render Transfer order legal and valid. It must stand to the test of legal scrutiny. Learned P.O. has tendered file to show that the post of Deputy Director of Marketing, Directorate Pune was vacant and it was necessary to fill-in and that is why the Applicant is transferred. When specifically asked, she concedes that said post was vacant for approximately six months. This being the position, it is not that the said post had fallen vacant recently. No attempt was made to fill-in the said post in general transfer.

7) True, in terms of Section 4 proviso (i) of Transfer Act, 2005, Transfer can be made at any time in the year to fill-in newly created post or to the posts which become vacant due to retirement, promotion etc. However, this proviso could be resorted in case were the Government servant has already completed tenure and due for transfer as held by Hon'ble High Court in **Ramakant B. Kendre's case (cited supra).**

2

Hon'ble High Court examined the scheme of Transfer Act, 2005 particularly situation where the Transfer under Rule 4(4) proviso (i) were permissible and in Para 13 held as under:-

13) It can clearly be seen that the said enactment, particularly Subsection (1) of Section 4 specifically protects a Government servant from being transferred prior to completion of his ordinary tenure. Subsection (4) of Section 4 requires such transfers to be done once in a year i.e. in the month of April or May. The proviso thereto, though permits the transfers to be made any time in the year for the eventualities mentioned therein, however, we are of the considered view that the proviso to Subsection (4) cannot be read in such a manner, which makes the provision of Subsection (1) of Section 4 redundant or nugatory. Clause (i) of the proviso to Subsection (4), which permits transfer to be made at any time in a year on the ground of eventualities mentioned therein, will have to be read in a manner that the transfer on the grounds mentioned in clause (i) of proviso to Subsection (4) would be permissible at any time of the year and not necessarily in April or May when a Government servant has completed his tenure of posting. If it is not read in that manner, the very purpose of the protection, which is granted in Subsection (1) of Section 4 would become redundant and nugatory. A person, who has not completed even three months in a particular posting, could be transferred to some post, which has become vacant on account of transfer of another Government servant, who was working on the post. As such, the clause (i) of proviso to Sub section (4) will have to be read in harmony with Subsection (1) of Section 4 of the said Act. It will have to be interpreted that a Government servant will not be ordinarily transferred prior to completion of his tenure, and the transfers will have to be made only in the month of April or May. However, if transfer is necessitated on account of any of eventualities stated in clause (i) to proviso of Subsection (4), it can be made at any time of the year and not necessarily in April or May, however, only on completion of tenure of the Government servant."

8) Admittedly the Applicant has not completed normal tenure to invoke Section 4(4)(i) of Transfer Act. No special case is made out as contemplated under Section 4 (5) of Transfer Act, 2005.

9) In view of above, *prima-facie* the impugned transfer order is not in consonance with Transfer Act, 2005 and liable to be stayed. Interim relief as prayed in Para 10 (a) is granted.

10) The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not paid.

11) Issue notice before admission returnable on 02.03.2023.

12) Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondent intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Private service is allowed. Respondents are put to notice that the case may be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.

13) This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

14) By Hand delivery, speed post, courier notice to be served and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

15) In case notice is not collected within seven days or service report on affidavit is not filed three days before returnable date, the Original / Miscellaneous Applications shall be placed on board before the concerned Benches under the caption "for Dismissal" and thereafter on the subsequent date the Original / Miscellaneous Applications shall stand dismissed.

16) S.O. to 02.03.2023.

17) Steno Copy and hamdast granted.

• Sd/-

(A.P. KURHEKAR) MEMBER (J)

Place: Mumbai Date: 06.02.2023 Dictation taken by: N.M. Naik.

G _NAIK\2023\02-Order 23\02-Feb 2023\06.02.2023\O.A.147 of 2023_O. = 06.02.2023 [Transfer].doc

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No.	of 20		District Applicat	nt/s
(Advocate)			
	versus			
The C4		htu's and others		
Ine Sta	ate of Manaras	htra and others		
			Responder	nt/s
(Presenting Officer	••••••)		
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Corar Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	n,	Tribun	al's orders	
	Date	: 06.02.2023		
		M.A.No.51/202	3 in O.A.No.1276/2022	•
	J.R. I	Deshmukh	Applicant	
	The S	Vs. State of Maharash	ntra & OrsRespondents	
	1.	Heard Mr. K.R.	Jagdale, learned Advocate f	for
	the A	Applicant and M	As. S.P. Manchekar, learn	ed
	Chief	Presenting Office	er for the Respondents.	
	2.	We direct lear	ned Advocate to explain w	hy
	we sh	nould not dismis	sed the matter in view of t	he
	relief	prayed and the	fact that necessary parties a	ŧre
	not m	ade party Respo	ndent.	
	3.	Learned Advoc	ate seeks time. Adjourned	to
	20.02	2.2023 under the	caption 'For Dismissal'.	
		Sd/-	Sd/-	
	(Me Me	dha Gadgil) ember(A)	(Mridula Bhatkar, J Chairperson	J.)
	prk			
			· · · ·	
· · · · ·				
	1			

.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

	MOMD		
Original Application No.	of 20	Distri	ст Applicant/s
(Advocate)		
	versus	3	
The Stat	te of Mahara	shtra and others	
			Respondent/s
(Presenting Officer)	
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders		Tribunal's orde : 06.02.2023	rs
		M.A.No.7/2023 in O.A	.No.96/2021
		M.M. Mahind & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Or	Applicants sRespondents.
	1.	Heard Mr. Kranti L.C.,	learned Advocate for
	the	Applicant and Ms. K.S.	S. Gaikwad, learned
	Pres	enting Officer holding for	Mr. A.J. Chougule,
	leari	ned Presenting Officer for t	he Respondents.
	2.	We protect the services	of the applicants till
	14.0	3.2023.	

3. Adjourned to 20.02.2023.

Sd/-

(Medha Gadgil) Member(A)

prk

/(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson

Sd/-

>

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

ģ

2

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	<u>O.A. No.267 of 2016</u>	
		licants
	Vs. The State of Maharashtra & OrsResp	ondents
	Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Ad the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. Ld. PO submits that positive proposal Public Health Department to GAD on 25.1.2023.	is sent by
	3. Ld. Advocate for the applicants seeks lea General Administration Department as party respo in the array of respondents.	ave to add indent no.5
	4. Amendment be carried out forthwith and copy be served on all concerned.	1 amended
	5. Responsible officer from GAD and Department are directed to remain present Tribunal on the next date.	l Finance before the
	6. For the purpose of response we keep this 10.2.2023.	matter on
	Sd/-	
	(Medha Gadgil) Member (A) 6.2.2023 (sgj) (Mridula Bhatkar, J. Chairperson 6.2.2023 (Sgj))

.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ļ

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<u>O.A. No.935 of 2022</u>
	S.D. KatkoliApplicant Vs.
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents
	Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. Ld. Advocate for the applicant produced a letter dated 6.2.2023 signed by the applicant addressed to Registrar of this Tribunal seeking permission to withdraw the above OA. The said letter is taken on record and marked Court Exhibit 'X' for identification.
	3. In view of the above, OA is allowed to be withdrawn and disposed off as such.
	Sd/-
	Sd/- (Medba Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.)
	Member (A) Chairperson 6.2.2023 6.2.2023 (sgj)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders

O.A. No.311 of 2022

Dr. (Smt) Kirti D. Badave Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

..Applicant

..Respondents

Heard Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Ld. CPO submits that pursuant to order dated 5.4.2022 passed by this Tribunal in the above OA, the applicant was allowed to appear in the interview by MPSC for the post of Assistant Director, Directorate of Forensic Science Laboratory, General State Service, Group-A. Ld. CPO submits that applicant appeared for interview on 6.4.2022 and applicant has secured 54 marks and was considered for Open General and Open Female. The candidate selected for Open General has secured 68 marks and so far as Open Female is concerned the candidate has secured 65 marks. Thus the applicant has secured less mark than the other candidates and therefore she is out of the race.

3. Ld. Advocate for the applicant submits that by said order dated 5.4.2022 the MPSC was ordered to keep the result in sealed cover.

4. We agree that the MPSC should not have opened the sealed cover. Ld. CPO on query has admitted that it was a mistake on the part of MPSC. We want that MPSC should be careful about such orders.

5. Ld. Advocate for the applicant submits that matter be heard on merits on the point of eligibility of the candidate.

6. We make it clear that in our interim order dated 5.4.2022 we have made a specific observation in para 9 and 10 about the eligibility of the candidate and we have allowed the applicant to appear for interview. However, applicant has secured less mark than other candidates. Therefore, no further decision is required.

7. In view of the above, now nothing remains in the matter and the same is disposed off accordingly.

Sd/-

.

٨

(Medha Gadgil) Member (A) 6.2.2023 /(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson 6.2.2023

Sd/-

(sgj)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Ċ

ż

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<u>O.A. No.542 of 2015</u>
	R.H. JadhavApplicant
	Vs. The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents
	Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. As the officer of the department is busy in election duty the matter is adjourned to 15.2.2023.
	Sd/- Sd/-
	(Medha Gadgfl) / (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson 3.2.2023 3.2.2023 (sgj)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribuna	l's orders
	<u>03.02.2023</u>	
	<u>0.A 1</u>	264/2022
	R.B Kale Vs.	Applicant
	The State of Maharashtra	a & Ors Respondents
	1. None present for Swati Manchekar, learne	r the applicant. Heard Ms d C.P.O for the Respondents.
	2. Affidavit in repl Respondents.	y is already filed by the
	3. Time granted to rejoinder.	o the applicant for filing
	4. S.O to 17.2.2023.	
		Sd/-
	Sd/-	
	(Medha [/] Gadgil) Member (A) ^{Akn}	(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson
		-
		[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
· · · · · ·		
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A. No.150 of 2023	
	Dr. R.A. KolekarApplicant Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. The Applicant has challenged order dated 02.02.2023 issued by Respondent No.2 – Deputy Director, Health Services, Pune Civil whereby the Applicant is temporarily attached to Rural Hospital, Pimpode, Dist Satara. Presently Applicant is serving as Medical Officer Group I Sub District Hospital Karmala.	
	3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant has pointed out that in terms of Circular dated 28.02.2011, thereby Respondent No.2 could make such arrangement at the level of Deputy Director only for seven days but in present case the Applicant is shown attacheto Rural Hospital, Pimpode, Dist Satara till further order.	
	4. Learned P.O. sought one day time to take instruction as how Deputy Director is empowered to pass such impugned order.	
	5. O.A. be kept for tomorrow.	
	6. S.O. to 07.02.2023.	
	n Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)	
	NMN .	

[*P.T.O.*

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

Ŧ

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023
	M. A. No.8 of 2023 in O.A.No.14 of 2023
	S. S. Wagh since deceased legal heirs L. S. Wagh & AnrsApplicants
	Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicants and Smt. Kranti Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. This M.A. is filed for condonation of delay of seven
	months to challenge the communication dated 25.04.2019
	whereby the claim of deceased Government servant for 2nd
	benefit of Time Bound Promotion was rejected. The
	Applicants have counted seven months delay having regard
	to the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court about
	extension of period of limitation due to Covid -19 Pandemic
	Situation and lockdown. No reply is filed by the Government.
	3. Since the Applicants are legal representatives of the
	deceased Government servant, in the interest of justice, I am
	inclined to condone the delay caused in filing O.A.
	M.A. is accordingly allowed with no order as to costs.
	sd/-
	A .
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)
	sm

Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

-

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023
	O.A.No.14 of 2023
	S. S. Wagh since deceased legal heirs L. S. Wagh & AnrsApplicants
	Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicants and Smt. Kranti Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. This O.A. is filed along with M.A.No.8/2023 which is
	allowed today.
	3. The Respondents are therefore required to file reply.
	Three weeks time is granted to file reply to O.A.
	4. S.O. to 20.02.2023.
	۲ Sd/-
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

+

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	M. A. No.2 of 2023 in O.A.No.1274 of 2022	
	B. S. KapseApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Shri A. S. Dhannawat , learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. On request of learned P.O., two weeks time is granted	
	to file reply as a last chance.	
	3. S.O. to 20.02.2023.	
	Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J) vsm	

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

[*P.T.O.*]

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No. of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	· ·	
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A. No.138 of 2023	
	K.A. BelureApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate	
	for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. O.A. is filed only for direction to decide Review	
	Application (R.A.) dated 30.11.2021 filed by the	
	Applicant before Government. In the morning session learned P.O. was directed to take instruction about the	
	status of R.A.	
	3. In afternoon session, learned P.O. submits that	
	R.A. is already dismissed by Government and communication was decided on 25.01.2023. He has	
	tendered communication dated 25.01.2023 for perusal	
- -	of record. It is taken on record and marked by letter 'X'.	
	4. In view of above, learned Advocate for the Applicant submits to dispose of O.A. with liberty to	
	challenge the impugned communication in accordance	
	to law.	
	5. Allowed to withdraw O.A. with liberty to avail legal remedy in accordance to law.	
	legal remedy in accordance to law.	
	6. No order to costs.	
	\mathbf{N}	
	Sd/-	
	V	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)	
	NMN	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

 $\frac{1}{1}$

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	M.A. No.190 of 2022 in O.A. No.880 of 2021 with M.A. No.191 of 2022 in O.A. No.881 of 2021 with M.A. No.197 of 2022 in O.A. No.882 of 2021 with O.A. No.883 of 2021 with M.A. No.192 of 2022 in O.A. No.884 of 2021 with M.A. No.195 of 2022 in O.A. No.885 of 2021 with M.A. No.194 of 2022 in O.A. No.886 of 2021 with O.A. No.887 of 2021 with M.A. No.196 of 2022 in O.A. No.888 of 2021 with O.A. No.889 of 2021 with M.A. No.193 of 2022 in O.A. No.917 of 2021	
	D.B. Mane & OrsApplicants	
	V/s	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Counsel for the Applicants and Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. Today, learned P.O. has filed reply on behalf of	
	Respondent Nos.1 to 3 in M.A. No.191/2022. It is taken on	
	record.	
	3. S.O. to 24.02.2023. Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J) vsm	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023 O.A.No.26 of 2023	
	D. S. BaneApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Kranti Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. The Applicant has challenged the order dated	
	10.03.2022 whereby he was temporarily deputed at Head	
	Quarter, Ratnagiri.	
	3. The Applicant was serving as Police Head Constable at	
	Mandangad Police Station, Dist. Ratnagiri.	
	4. The perusal of impugned order dated 10.03.2022	
	reveals that the Applicant was temporarily deputed at Head	
	Quarter, Ratnagiri without there being any decision of PEB.	
	The period of temporary deputation should not be such a	
	long period otherwise it amounts to transfer under guise of	
	temporary deputation. One month period is availed to file	
	reply but the same is not filed.	
	5. Today, learned P.O. on telephonic instruction submits	
	that Respondent is taking necessary steps to repatriate the	
	Applicant on his previous post and sought two seeks time.	
	6. In view of above, the O.A. is disposed of with	
	direction to Respondent to repatriate the Applicant at	
	Mandangad Police Station within two weeks from today.	
	7. No order as to costs. N Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar)	
	Vsm Vsm	
	[<i>P.T.O.</i>	

(G.C.P.) J 2959 (A) (50,000-3-2017)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT Applicant/s

(Advocate)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders

Tribunal's orders

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date: 06.02.2023.	
	O.A. No.763 of 2021	
	Y.R. HansekarApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Smt. Sonali Humane, learned Advocate holding for Smt. Ranjana Todankar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. The Applicant has filed O.A. for direction to Respondents particularly Respondent No.3 – Divisional Commissioner, Women and Child Development, Pune to consider his application dated 02.12.2019 seeking appointment in terms of recommendation of Lad Page Committee as reflected in G.R. dated 21.10.2011 and 26.02.2014.	
	3. The perusal of record reveals that the Applicant has made various representations and his proposal was sent to Respondent No.3 by Respondent No.7. However, Respondent No.3 by letter dated 07.07.2021 raised certain queries from Respondent No.7 and since then no further steps is taken.	
	4. Respondent No.3 - Divisional Commissioner, Women and Child Development, Pune is the competent authority to take all the decisions but has not filed Affidavit-in-Reply. Affidavit-in-Reply is filed on behalf of Respondent No.4 to 7 only denying the entitlement of the Applicant. Record does not reveals what happened in respect of the letter dated 07.07.2021 Respondent No.3 addressed to Respondent No.7. Indeed, Respondent No.7 ought to have supplied	
	necessary information so that Respondent No.3 could take appropriate decision.	
	[<i>P.T.O</i> .	

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders

Tribunal's orders

5. In view of above, O.A. is disposed of with direction to Respondent No.3 - Divisional Commissioner, Women and Child Development, Pune to take necessary steps in pursuance of his letter dated 07.07.2021 sent to Respondent No.7 for necessary information and pass appropriate order of the claim of the Applicant in terms of Lad Page Committee within three months from today.

6. Decision be communicated to the Applicant within two weeks thereafter. If the Applicant felt aggrieved he may avail further legal remedy.

7. No order as to costs.

 $\left(\right)$ Sd/-

(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)

NMN

 $\mathbf{2}$

, **)** ,

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

 $\frac{1}{1}$

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	O.A.No.1139 of 2022	
	T. G. BholeApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. This O.A.is filed along with M.A.No.686/2022 for condonation of delay which is allowed today. The	
	Respondents are, therefore, required to file reply to O.A.	
	3. Two weeks time is granted to file reply.	
	4. S.O. to 20.02.2023.	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)	
	[<i>P.T.O.</i>	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023 M. A. No.686 of 2022 in O.A.No.1139 of 2022 T. G. Bhole Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors. Respondents. 1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. This M.A.is filed for condonation of delay of three and half months which is counted from 01.08.2022 i.e. the date when Contempt Application is disposed by the Tribunal which
	 was filed arising from O.A.No.1158/2016. Now, the Applicants are claiming benefit of the decision rendered in O.A.No.1158/2016 stating that they are similarly situated persons. 3. Though enough time is granted, no reply is filed to M.A
	4. On previous date itself, the matter was proceeded without reply since no reply is filed within time. Today, also no reply is filed.
	 5. In view of above, in the interest of justice, I am inclined to condone the delay caused in filing O.A. 6. In view of above, M.A.No.686/2022 for condonation of delay is allowed. No order as to costs.
	N Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar)
	(A.P. Kurnekar) Member(J)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A.No	.120 of 2023
	S. N. Patil	Applicant
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra 8	orsRespondents.
		Mahajan, learned Counsel for the ti Gaikwad, learned Presenting
	2. When the matter	is taken up for admission, it is
	noticed that Applicant has	not challenged one order dated
	03.03.2022 issued by the Re	spondent No.2 which needs to be
	challenged.	
	3. Learned Counsel for	the Applicant sought permission
	to file M.A. for amendment.	
		anted to take necessary steps.
	5. S.O. to 13.02.2023.	η
		Sd/-
		(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)
	vsm	
		[<i>P.T.O.</i>

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A. No.427 of 2018	
	R.J. Sawant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	Applicant Respondents.
	 Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadek for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Presenting Officer for the Responde This matter was before 	Chougule, learned ents. Division Bench bu
	recently transferred to Single Ben first time it is listed before this Ben 3. Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar sub Vakalatnama in place of Advocate requested for two weeks time to ar	ch for hearing. omits that he is filing e Shri S.S. Dere and
	4. S.O. for Final Hearing on 21.	02.2023.
	Š	Sd/-
	-	Kurhekar) ember (J)
	NMN	
		[<i>P.T.O.</i>

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date: 06.02.2023 O.A. No.31 of 2020 with O.A.	No.22 of 2021
	with O.A. No.765 of	2020
	D.K. Zote D.M. Bhonde T.P. Rathod Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	Applicant Respondents.
	 Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadek for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Presenting Officer for the Responde 	Chougule, learned
	2. Learned P.O. submits that the is already filed and Division Bench the M.A. He therefore requested the decision of M.A. No.164/2022.	has issued notice on
	3. S.O. to 08.03.2023.	
		∿ Sd/-
		, Kurhekar) ember (J)
	NMN	
		[PTO.

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

IN

of 20 Original Application No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date: 06.02.2023
	O.A. No.903 of 2016
	S.B. SasteApplicant
	Versus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	 Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. This O.A. was kept in sine-die list awaiting the decision of the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No.876/2014 for a long time.
	3. Learned P.O. submits that W.P. is still subjudice.
	4. S.O. to 09.03.2023.
	Sd/-
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)
	NMN
· · · · · ·	

59(B) (50,000–3-2017) [Spl.- MAT-F-2 E. THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date: 06.02.2023
	O.A. No.63 of 2021
	R.G. LandeApplicant Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. On request of learned P.O. adjourned to 08.03.2023.
	Sd/-
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)
	NMN

(G.C.P.) J 2959(B) (50,000-3-2017)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A. No.1180 of 2022	2
	Dr. A.M. Zende Versus	Applicant
	The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	Respondents.
	1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, for the Applicant, Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, le Officer for the Respondents and Res person is present.	earned Presenting
	2. Respondent No.2 in person reweek time to file his Affidavit-in-Reply.	
	3. S.O. to 13.02.2023.	
	n Sd,	/_
	(A.P. Kur Memb	
	NMN	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or	Tribunal's orders	
directions and Registrar's orders	Date : 06.02.2023	
	O.A.No.27 of 2023	
	Dr. S. D. JadhavApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	 Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan , learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Kranti Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 	
	2. On request of learned P.O., one week time is granted to file reply.	
	3. S.O. to 13.02.2023.	
	Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)	
	vsm	
	[<i>P.T.O.</i>	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

of 20

ΙΝ

Original Application No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	O.A.No.15 of 2023	
	S. K. KuklareApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Shri M. D. Lonkar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. Two weeks time is granted to learned P.O. to file	
	reply on behalf of C.P. Mumbai as well as C.P. Aurangabad.	
	3. S.O. to 24.02.2023.	
	റ Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

+

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribuna	l's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	0.A.I	No.350 of 2020
	Dr. Shaikh M.A. S.	Applicant
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra	& OrsRespondents.
		n Mahajan , learned Counsel for th hougule, learned Presenting Offic
	2. On request of lear	ned P.O., two weeks time is grante
	to file reply by way of last	chance with specific direction the
	no further time will be give	en.
	3. S.O. to 20.02.2023	
		\sim
		Sd/-
	vsm	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)

|Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's o	orders
	Date: 06.02.2023	
	O.A. No.4	18 of 2017
	S.D. Kharat	Applicant
	Versus The State of Maharashtra ۵	& OrsRespondents.
	the Applicant, Smt. K.S. (onkar, learned Advocate for Gaikwad, learned Presenting ents and Shri R. Gadhari, i is absent.
	2. On request of Applicant one week time is	learned Advocate for the s granted for hearing.
	3. S.O. to 13.02.2023.	
		Sd/-
		(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)
	NMN	
		[<i>P.T.O.</i>

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

╉

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Tribunal's orders
Date : 06.02.2023
O.A.No.1275 of 2022
C. K. MoreApplicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
1. Heard Shri G. A. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. On request of learned P.O., two weeks time is granted
to filed reply by way of last chance.
3. S.O. to 21.02.2023.
Sd/-
(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023
	O.A.No.134 of 2023
	C. R. GangodeApplicant
	Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	1. Heard Shri K. R. Jagdale, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Office for the Respondents.
	2. The Applicant has challenged the communication
	dated 15.12.2022 issued by the Respondent -Superintende
	of Police, Nashik (Rural) rejecting the claim of substitution
	name in waiting list for compassionate appointment.
	3. The office objection, if any, are to be removed an court fees to be paid, if not already paid.
	4. Issue notice before admission returnable of 01.03.2023
	5. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve of Respondent intimation/notice of date of hearing du authenticated by Registry, along with complete pap book of O.A. Private service is allowed. Responden are put to notice that the case may be taken up for fin disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
	6. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 2 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedur Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation ar alternate remedy are kept open.
	7. By Hand delivery, speed post, courier notice be served and acknowledgement be obtained ar produced along with affidavit of compliance in th Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to fi Affidavit of compliance and notice.
	8. In case notice is not collected within <u>seven</u> days service report on affidavit is not filed <u>three</u> days befor returnable date, the Original/ Miscellaneous Application shall be placed on board before the concerned Bench under the caption " <u>for Dismissal</u> " and thereafter on the subsequent date the Original / Miscellaneous Application shall stand dismissed.
	9. S.O. to 01.03.2023 Sd/-

 $\mathbf{2}$

╉

Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, pearance, Tribunal's orders or ections and Registrar's orders		Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.		
		O.A.No.139 of 3	
	R. S. Mane		Applicant
	Versus		
	The State of N	Maharashtra & Ors.	Respondents.
	the Applicant		dekar, learned Counse ougule, learned Preser
	disciplinary a of withholdin effect and al	uthority dated 16.04.2 ng of increments for t	ed the order passed by 2019 imposing punishr two years with cumula rder of appellate auth shment.
		office objection, if any be paid, if not already	iy, are to be removed y paid.
		notice before ad	dmission returnable
	Respondent authenticate book of O. are put to r	intimation/notice o ed by Registry, alor .A. Private service	and directed to serv of date of hearing ng with complete p is allowed. Respond may be taken up for n hearing.
	of the Mah Rules, 1988	harashtra Administra	s ordered under Rul ative Tribunal (Procee ns such as limitation
	be served produced Registry wi	and acknowledge along with affidavi	ed post, courier notic ement be obtained it of compliance in oplicant is directed to ce.
	8. In ca service rep returnable shall be pla under the	ase notice is not colle ort on affidavit is no date, the Original/ aced on board befor caption " <u>for Dismiss</u> t date the Original /	lected within <u>seven</u> da not filed <u>three</u> days b Miscellaneous Applic ore the concerned Ben <u>sal</u> " and thereafter o Miscellaneous Applic
	9. S.O.	. to 01.03.2023.	ິ Sd/-
		()	A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)

vsm

ł

 $\mathbf{2}$

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 06.02.2023
	O.A.No.1216 of 2022
	Dr. V. K. PatneApplicant
	Versus
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.
	1. Heard Shri M. B.Kadam holding for Shri S. S. Der learned Counsel for the Applicant and Shri A. J. Chougul learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
	2. On request of learned P.O., two weeks time is grante
	for filing reply by way of last chance.
	3. S.O. to 21.02.2023.
	n Sd/-
	N ⁻
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)
	vsm

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders	
	Date : 06.02.2023	
	O.A.No.1151 of 2022	
	P. S. KadamApplicant	
	Versus	
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.	
	1. Heard Smt Prerana Agavekar holding for Shri A. S. Gaikwad, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.	
	2. On request of learned P.O., two weeks time is granted	
	for filing reply.	
	3. S.O. to 20.02.2023.	
	Sd/-	
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J) vsm	

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

ΙN

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders Date : 06.02.2023 O.A.No.1113 of 2022 with O.A. No.1167 of 2022		
	B. T. Rathod P. J. MahaleApplicant		
	Versus The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.		
	1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicants, Shri A. J. Chougule and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officers for the Respondents.		
	2. Today, learned P.O. has filed reply in		
	O.A.No.1113/2022. It is taken on record. Insofar as		
	O.A.No.1167/2022 is concerned, no reply is filed.		
	3. Both Original Applications being inter connected, it be		
	kept for hearing together.		
	4. S.O.to 28.02.2023.		
	Sd/-		
	(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J) vsm		

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders			
	Date : 06.02.2023			
		A.No.950 of 2022		
	S. G. Pawar	Applicant		
	Versus			
	The State of Maharasht	ra & OrsRespondents.		
	 Heard Shri Pravin Sabban holding for Shri R. P. Sabban, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 			
	2. On request of le	arned Counsel for the Applicant, two		
	weeks time is granted to	weeks time is granted to file Rejoinder.		
	3. S.O. to 20.02.20	23.		
		Sd/-		
		(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)		
	vsm			

|Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

ł

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders		
	Date : 06.02.2023		
	O.A.No.1235 of 2022 G. V. BellaleApplicant Versus		
	The State of Maharashtra	& OrsRespondents.	
		Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting ts.	
	2. On request of lear	ned P.O., two weeks time is granted	
	for filing reply.		
	3. S.O. to 21.02.2023	3.	
		∩ Sd/-	
		(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)	
	vsm		

|Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.

 $\frac{1}{1}$

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders Date : 06.02.2023 O.A.No.1257 of 2022 with O.A. No.1258 of 2022			
	S. S. Pawar & Ors. S. D. Walunj & OrsApplicants		Applicants	
	Versu	IS		
	The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.			
	 Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicants, Smt. Kranti Gaikwad & Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. Learned P.O. submits that reply is under preparation and same will be filed during the course of the day, if possible 			
	other	wise by tomorrow with	out fail. The statement is	
	accepted. It be taken on record. The copy be served to other			
	side.			
	3.	Two weeks time is grant	ed to file Rejoinder.	
	4.	S.O. to 21.02.2023.		
			Sd/-	
			Su/-	
	VCD		(A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)	
	vsm			