IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 185 OF 2015

DISTRICT : Nashik

Shri Mangalrao Popatrao Sonawane)...**Applicant**

VERSUS

State of Maharashtra & Ors.)....**Respondents**

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

Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

DATE : 07.04. 2016

ORDER

1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents states that instructions are still awaited.

3. 'Instructions are still awaited' is a polite and decorated statement, and does not reveal the truth as regards fact, namely what is the stage of furnishing instructions.

4. Learned P.O. for the Respondents was called to states as to whether anybody from the Respondents have contacted the office of P.O.

5. Learned P.O. for the Respondents states that though the communications are sent to the Respondents instructions are not recieved so far.

6. Principal Secretary, Vocational, Education and Training Department is directed to file his own affidaviat on following points:-

(a) The date of receipt of notice of this Tribunl and/or letter/letters from the office of P.O.

(b) The date when the notice/letter/letters were brough to his notice.

(c) Reasons as to why no cognizance has taken.

(d) Reasons as to why P.O. is not instructed.

(e) In case the matter had not come to his notice, what modalities he would adopt to direct the office to bring to his personal notice any case before Tribunal.

(f) Reasons as to why Applicant's appeal is not decided.

(g) Time frame within which the Applicant's appeal would be decided.

(h) Show cause as to why he should not be saddled with personal costs in failing to take cognizance and give instructions to the learned P.O.

7. Affidavit answering points mentioned in foregoing paragraph be filed on or before 29.04.2016.

8. Secretary, Vocation Education and Trainng Department is directed to place on record modality by which no sooner the notice/ order etc. was received, the same would be attended, responded etc. and P.O. would be instructed well in time.

9. It is hoped that unless appeal is already decided, it be decided before next date.

10. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to learned P.O. to communicate this order to the Respondents.

11. S.O. to 29.04.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

3

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 1021/2015. D.B. Matter

Shri Ganesh Bharat Shinde ..Applicant

Versus

The Superintendent of Police,
Pune (R) ..Respondents

Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the applicant.
Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Coram: Justice A.H. Joshi, Chairman
Date: 07.04.2016

ORDER

(1) Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

(2) This case was taken up for hearing yesterday. The learned P.O was directed to secure the papers/office files in which a decision about applicant's case was recorded.

(3) The learned P.O has produced the record from the office of Superintendent of Police (Rural) Pune. The record contains a Character Verification Report showing that the criminal case is pending against the applicant and minutes of the Committee.

(4) The minutes of the proceedings of the Committee at the level of Collector reveals that applicant's case was considered and he was adjudged to be ineligible for appointment due to pendency of criminal case against him and then the case was submitted to the Government.

(5) It is reported that the Government has considered the matter of eligibility of applicant and has accepted the position as held by the Committee at the level of Collector.

(6) Government record is not produced. Therefore, it is not possible to know as to whether the committee at the level of Government had applied mind to the charge sheet and the role which is attributed to the applicant in the said criminal case.

(7) In past many cases have come before this Tribunal, where the matter of appointment in the Police Department was considered by the Government. Papers relating to such cases were also produced. It had transpired that the decision was taken at the Government level barely on the basis of report i.e. without studying the charge sheet or substance of the matter, and without calling the report of Investing Officer.

(8) Learned PO was called to state as to what material was available before the Govt. at the time of taking the decision.

(9) Learned PO has taken instructions and states that the same material as was available before the committee at the district level was placed before the Government.

(10) It is thus evident that eligibility of applicant's candidature is decided barely on a character verification report showing pendency of case and rather without applying mind to the matters/statements of witnesses etc. showing involvement and role of applicant in the commission of offences as would emerge, prima facie, from record.

(11) Ruling a candidature barely on the basis of pendency of case and without adverting the material which could be available, but is not called for does not appear to be just and fair. This way of working needs to be corrected, rather set in proper order.

(12) The Secretary of the Department ought to device modalities which may/could include calling of the copy of charge sheet when filed, F.I.R and other documents or comments of the investigating officer and case diary when charge sheet is not filed

and the investigation is still pending. After studying the case, ascertaining exact role and/or involvement of the candidate in commission of offence as ascribed and as seen prima facie, the decision as to whether the candidate be offered appointment, it be declined or deferred etc. needs to be considered.

(13) The learned Presenting Officer was directed to furnish the name of the concerned Secretary. It is furnished as: - Dr. Shri Vijay Satbir Singh, Principal Secretary, Home Department, stating that he is the officer who is involved in dealing with matters of present nature.

(14) Dr. Vijay Satbir Singh, Principal Secretary, Home Department is directed as follows:

(a) He should apply mind to the aspects touched in foregoing paras, and place on record after deciding the policy, and issue instructions as to the manner in which the Committee/Department should examine the matters, effect of pendency of investigation of crime/criminal case, after studying the charge sheet, documents contained therein, case diary etc. as the case be, in order to ascertain the role ascribed/attributed to the applicant, gravity of the offence involved etc., for deciding as to whether such candidate be offered the employment in Police Force, that the matter be deferred or declined.

(b) He shall file affidavit after issuing instructions, by placing on record the instructions as he may issue, within six weeks from today.

(15) Steno copy and hamdast is allowed to learned PO for communication.

(16) S.O. to 6.5.2016.

Sd/-
(A.H. Joshi,)
Chairman

Psz

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders M.A. No.433 of 2014 in O.A. No.734 of 2014

Shri Dinesh D. Meshram ..Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri A.S. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. The applicant who apparently has become disabled as a result of road accident while in employment and who alleges the breach of the beneficial provisions of Section 47 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 seeks condonation of delay which apparently is about 1 year and 3 months.

3. The cause assigned is post accident trauma and treatment and his entitlement to the above referred provisions. The 9 page affidavit in reply deals with the facts ~~following~~ having within the office of the OA more than it does the MA itself. As far as the cause is concerned if the accident as a fact is an established fact then the subsequent delay even if it was there is capable of being explained. If this Tribunal were to insist of anything more then perhaps ~~then~~ it would join the company of respondents in so far as exhibition of insensitivity is concerned. I uphold this MA and condone the delay. MA is allowed in these terms with no order as to costs.

4. The applicant and this Tribunal are directed to process the matter further. Inasmuch as the OA post substitution has also been served the same be placed for filing affidavit in reply thereto. S.O. to 5.5.2016.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik) 7.4.16
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE : 7/4/16
CORAM :
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE :
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.S. Deshpande
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /~~Smt.~~ A.J. chougule
~~C.P.O~~ / P.O. for the Respondents

~~Adj to~~ M.A. is Allowed
O.A. Adj. to 5/5/16.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.11 of 2016

Shri D.N. Kale ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri A.S. Gadre, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 24.6.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 24.6.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE : 7/4/16

CORAM :

~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)

APPEARANCE :

~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.S. Gadre

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri /Smt.~~ K.S. Gaikwad

~~C.P.O./P.O.~~ for the Respondents

~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 24/6/16.

3

(G.C.P.) J 2260(B) (50,000—2-2015) [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

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

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

O.A. No.104 of 2016

Shri S.P. More ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri P.V. Suryawanshi, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Rejoinder is taken on record. Admit. Sur-rejoinder, if any, must be filed on that date and not thereafter. Shri Suryawanshi, Ld. Advocate states that a fixed date be given because he is Aurangabad based. In these ~~set of~~ circumstances the OA be placed before second Division Bench for final hearing on 28.4.2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16

CORAM:

~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)

APPEARANCE:

~~Shri/Smt.~~ P.V. Suryawanshi

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.J. Chougule

C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondents

Rejoinder filed by Applicant.

~~Adj. to~~

O.A. Admit.

S.O. to 28/4/16.

before

II D.B.

3

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.313 of 2016

Shri Pandurang B. Avhad ..Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 21.4.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 21.4.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) 7.4.16
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/~~Smt. : Punam Mahajan
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/~~Smt. : K. S. Gaikwad
~~C.P.O./P.O.~~ for the Respondents
~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 21/4/16.

3

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.312 of 2016

Shri Ramdas A. Kulkarni ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 21.4.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 21.4.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE : 7/4/16

CORAM :

~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)

APPEARANCE :

~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Punam Mahajan

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ : K.S. Gaikwad

~~C.P.O.~~/P.O. for the Respondents

~~Adj. To~~ : S.O. to 21/4/16.

3

(G.C.P.) J 2260(B) (50,000—2-2015) [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

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

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

O.A. No.1051 of 2015

Shri S.G. Kumbhar & Ors. ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri A.S. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Affidavit in reply of respondent no.2 has already been filed. The affidavits in reply of respondents no.1, 3 and 4 have not been filed. The OA proceeds without their affidavits in reply. Adjourned for rejoinder, if any, to the affidavit in reply of respondent no.2. S.O. to 21.4.2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) / 7.4.16
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16

CORAM:

~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)

APPEARANCE:

~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.S. Deshpande

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.J. Chougule

C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondents

~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 21/4/16

5

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.828 of 2015

Shri Kailash B. Mahajan & Ors. ..Applicants
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri K.M. Hosurkar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 5.5.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 5.5.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ K.M. Hosurkar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.J. Chougule
~~C.P.O~~/P.O. for the Respondents

~~Adj. To~~: S.O. to 5/5/16.

3

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.321 of 2016

Shri Vivek D. Tambe & Ors. ..Applicants
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 5.5.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 5.5.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ G.A. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri ~~/Smt.~~ A.J. Chougule
~~C.P.O./~~P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To:~~ S.O. to 5/5/16

3

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders O.A. No.323 of 2016

Shri Bharat B. Vyavahare ..Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice returnable on 5.5.2016.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

5. 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.

6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

7. S.O. to 5.5.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ G. A. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A. J. Chougule
~~C.P.O~~/P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To:~~ S.O. to 5/5/16.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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

O.A.843/2015

Heard Shri P.S. Bhavake, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise holding for Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Not on Board. Taken on Board.

Mr. Bhavake, the learned Advocate says that his client has been able to get a document which is the copy of On-line application form. The matter has already been appointed for final disposal. However, in the interest of justice, for the time being, it be removed from the column of order and be shown as Part Heard. But it is made clear that there must be a proper Affidavit sworn by the Applicant and filed by him along with which he must annex the document which according to him he has been able to lay his hands now.

S.O. to 20th April, 2016.

Sd/- Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) (Rajiv Agarwal)
Member (J) Vice-Chairman
11.04.2016 11.04.2016

(skw)

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL
(Vice - Chairman)
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
Shri/Smt. P.S. Bhavake
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /Smt. K.B. Bhise
C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondents

A.I. S.O. to 20/4/16
Part heard.

PY

[P.T.O.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.315 OF 2016

DISTRICT : KOLHAPUR

Shri Suhas Jagannath Wayachal ..Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & 2 Ors. ..Respondents

Shri Sandeep Dere – Advocate for the Applicant

Smt. K.S. Gaikwad – Presenting Officer for the Respondents

CORAM : R.B. Malik, Member (J)

DATE : 7th April, 2016

O R D E R

1. Heard Shri Sandeep Dere, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. This OA is placed for consideration of urgent interim relief. The applicant came to be recommended to the post of Assistant Executive Engineer, PWD by the MPSC. He was relieved from his earlier job of Assistant Executive Engineer-I, under Tillari Canal Division, Chorole on 28.3.2016. However, in the meanwhile

by the order dated 31.3.2016 the Government issued the impugned order (Exhibit A page 12 of the paper book) whereby the appointment of the applicant was cancelled because the MPSC who had recommended the applicant subsequently turned around and instead recommended Shri Abhinav Pawar. Shri Pawar has filed OA No.3 of 2016 before Nagpur Bench of this Tribunal. There was no stay in that OA but it seems to be the case of the MPSC that upon verification of the documents second time Shri Pawar was found eligible and he was in the manner of speaking above the applicant.

3. It is no doubt true that this OA is in the state of infancy and opportunity will have to be given to the respondents to file affidavit in reply. However, that by itself can not be ~~not~~ sufficient enough ground to leave the applicant completely unprotected. Shri Dere, Ld. Advocate contended that contrary to the normal practice of the MPSC even while they initially rejected the case of Shri Pawar they allowed his case to be reconsidered. As of today I express no opinion in that behalf.

4. However, there is another aspect of the matter. It appears that one Shri Deepak Dattatraya Dhole whose name was at Sr. No.24 from the same category as the applicant belongs to (applicant being at Sr. No.29) has decided against joining the duties. A document in that behalf is at Exhibit 'B' page 14 of the paper book.

5. Although Smt. Gaikwad, Ld. PO strongly urged that no interim relief be granted till such time as the respondents file

affidavit in reply. I am of the opinion, as already indicated above, that in the context of the facts such as they are the applicant cannot be left unprotected. The applicant has expressly sought the interim relief that those appointed should be made clear that their appointment would be subject to the outcome hereof. That interim relief is hereby granted till further orders.

6. As far as Shri Dhole's case is concerned it is indeed true that no specific interim relief is sought. However, there are circumstances that emanate from record and if they justify certain directions being given or even relief being granted, I do not think that this Tribunal would be so much ~~height~~ hide bound by the technicalities as to allow the substantial justice to be sacrificed. The Ld. PO may take instructions in so far as Shri Dhole is concerned and in case it is found that a vacancy has accrued as far as Shri Dhole is concerned then that vacancy be kept as it is till any other order is made by this Tribunal.

7. Issue notice returnable on 5.5.2016.

8. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.

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

10. 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.

11. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier 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.

12. S.O. to 5.5.2016. Ld. PO waives service of notice. Hamdast.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
7.4.2016

7.4.16

Date : 7th April, 2016

Dictation taken by: S.G. Jawalkar.

E:\JAWALKAR\Judgements\2016\4 April 2016\OA.315.16.J.4.2016-SJWayachal-SO.5.5.16.doc

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. [illegible] 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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : G.A. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 20/4/16. BVE	**Date : 7.04.2016** **C.A.No.133 of 2015 in O.A.No.1051 of 2012** **Shri Mangal Chandrakant Jadhav ...Applicant** **Vs.** **Shri Ujjawal Uke & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents states on instructions received from Smt. Uma Sawant, Under Secretary, Social Justice Department and S.B. Kadam, Office Superintendent, Social Welfare Department, Pune as follows:- Order passed in O.A.No.1051 of 2012 shall be complied till 11.4.2016, and Applicant can remain present to receive order in the office of Assistant ~~to~~ Commissioner, Social Welfare, M.S. Pune. 3. For reporting the compliance, adjourned to 20.4.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [Spl.- MAT-P-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.....)

Offics Notes, Office Memorands of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
DATE: 7/4/16 CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Kumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE: Shri/Smt. A.V. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 16/6/16 C.A. 1021/15	Date: 07.04.2016. (D.B. Matter) O.A. No. 984/2015 Shri S.A. Sarwade ..Applicant Versus The Superintendent of Police, Pune and Others ..Respondents (1) Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. (2) In view of the order passed in Original Application No. 1021/15 hearing of this Original Application is adjourned. (3) S.O to both the matters 16.06.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman Psz

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : ~~Shri/Smt.~~ : S.P. Manchekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 14/6/16.	Date: 07.04.2016. (D.B. Matter) C.A. No. 120/2015 in O.A. No. 313/2015 Dr.(Smt.)RizviS. Saiyed Ghulam Abbas.. ..Applicant Versus The State of Mah. & Ors. Respondents (1) Heard Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Mr. K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. (2) The learned P.O states as follows:- "Part of the order in so far as giving posting to the applicant as Associate Professor (Urdu) Maharashtra Educational Service, Group A is completed and the order is issued". (3) According to the learned advocate for the applicant part of the order is yet to be completed. (4) In view of the above development, hearing of this Contempt Application is adjourned to 14.06.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman Psz

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.42 of 2016

Shri Amruta Ramesh Bhai ..:Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents states that para-wise remarks are received, and two weeks time is required for filing reply.

3. Though two weeks time is required longer time is granted so that no further adjournment is necessary.

4. For filing reply, adjourned to 6.05.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi) J.J
Chairman

sba

DATE : 7/4/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri ... Kumar (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : K.R. Jagdale
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise
C.P.O. / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 6/5/2016.

[P.T.O.

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

Date: 07.04.2016.D.B. Matter

C.A. No. 04/2016 in O.A. 260/2012

Shri S.K.Pawar ..Applicant

Versus

Shri Sunil Porwal, Etc.2 ..Respondents

1) Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Special Counsel for the Contemnor.

(2) Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Special Counsel appearing for the Contemnor states as follows:-

(i) That the affidavit is drafted, but he would like to study the affidavit once again.

(ii) The Government has carried a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and the date of hearing is sought to be taken.

(3) In view of above submissions 10 days time is granted for filing affidavit. Let the Contempt Application come up for hearing on 5.05.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

Psz

DATE: 7/4/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble ... (Member) A
Advocate for Applicant Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for Respondents Shri M.D. Lonkar Counsel
C.P.O./P.O.

Adj. To 5/5/16

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A.~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : C.T. Chandratre Advocate for the Applicant Shri /Smt. : K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 16/6/16	Date: 07.04.2016. (D.B. Matter) O.A. No. 1058/2015 Shri N.B. Narang ..Applicant Versus The State of Mah. & Ors. .Respondents (1) Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. (2) The learned P.O on instructions received from the office of Director General of Police states as follows:- "Two months time is required for taking decision in the matter of examination and decision on the eligibility of applicant for promotion" (3) In view of the above statement, for reporting the compliance as may be done in the matter, hearing is adjourned to 16.06.2015. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman Psz

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE: 7/4/16 D.B CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE: ~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Punam Mahajan Advocate for the Applicant Shri /~~Smt.~~ : K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s ~~Adj. To~~ 21/4/16.	Date: 07.04.2016.D.B. Matter C.A. No. 136/2014 in O.A. No. 275/2010 Dr. Balaji Baburao Birajdar and Ors...Applicant Versus Smt.Sujata Sounik, Principal Secretary, Public Health Dept., Mantralaya,Mumbai. .Respondent (1) Heard Ms. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the applicant and Mr. K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. (2) The learned P.O prays for time on the ground that the department has asked for four weeks time for securing approval from G.A.D and Finance Department. (3) For reporting the steps taken adjourned to 21.04.2016 Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) V Chairman Psz

[P.T.O.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. [illegible] 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
	Date : 7.04.2016 **O.A.No.226 of 2016** **Shri Gangadhar Sakharam Musmade ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. None for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. At the request of learned P.O. for the Respondents, adjourned to 4.05.2016. Sd/- **(A.H. Joshi, J.)** **Chairman** Sba

DATE : 7/4/16.
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member) A

APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : None for the Appl.
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 4/5/16.

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh kumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : C.T. Chandratre Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 10/6/16 B.C.	**Date : 7.04.2016** **O.A.No.22 of 2016** **Shri Balasaheb Dada Pawar ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri C.T. Chandratre prays for enlargement of time for substitution of O.A. 3. Time enlarged for substitution upto 10.06.2016. 4. S.O. to 10.06.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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 snd Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 7.04.2016 **O.A.No.141 of 2016** **Shri Vishnu Krishnaji Pawar ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri R.G. Panchal, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays time for filing reply on the background that there was excessive work load in the office of P.O. 3. Time is granted by way of last chance. 4. S.O. to 5.05.2016. Sd/- **(A.H. Joshi, J.)** **Chairman** Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000---2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh~~kumar (Member) A APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : G.A. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri /Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 7/6/16 BYE	**Date : 7.04.2016** **O.A.No.254 of 2016** **Shri Nandkumar Sambhajirao Deshmukh ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays for four weeks time for filing reply. 3. Time as prayed for is granted. 4. For reply, adjourned to 7.6.2016. Sd/- **(A.H. Joshi, J)** **Chairman** Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramachandran (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : G.A. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri /Smt. : N.K. Rajpurohit C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s 1 & 2. Adv. S.P. Manchekar for R.3 Adj. To 16/6/16	**Date : 7.04.2016** **O.A.No.212 of 2016** **Shri Meena Bhimanand Sonawane ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant, Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents no.1 & 2 and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Respondent No.3. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondent has tendered reply. It is taken on record. 3. For filing rejoinder, only if it is necessary, adjourned to 16.6.2016. Sd/- **(A.H. Joshi, J.)** **Chairman** Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble ... A. H. Joshi (Chairman) Hon'ble ... (Member) A APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. G.A. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. K.S. Gaikwad C.P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To. 5/5/16	**Date : 7.04.2016** **O.A.No.255 of 2016** **Shri Vijaykumar Kashinathappa Patne ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays for time for filing reply. 3. Time as prayed for is granted. 4. Adjourned to 5.5.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No. 19 of 2016

Shri Sampat Trymbak Gunjal ...Applicant
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant, Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents and Shri D.H. Pawar, the learned Advocate for the Respondent No.4.

2. In the midst of haring learned Advocate for the Applicant prays for leave to amend and to incorporate the amendment.

3. Leave to amend as prayed for is granted.

4. Amendment be served on the Respondents.

5. For filing reply to the amended O.A., one week's time is granted.

6. S.O. to 22.04.2016.

Sd/-

~~A.H. Joshi, J.~~
Chairman

Sba

DATE : 7/4/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri A. Hamid Sinha (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. P. Mahajan
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. A.J. Chougule
C.P.O. / Advocate for the Respondent/s
Adv. D.H. Pawar for R.No 4.
Adj. To 22/4/16.

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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
DATE : 7/4/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh(Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. A.V. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. K.S. Gaikwad C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 20/6/16 BK	**Date : 7.04.2016** **O.A.No.211 of 2016** **Shri Arun Anand Sariputra ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The Deputy Director of Land Records & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents has tendered reply. It is taken on record. 3. S.O. to 20.06.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi,J) Chairman sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) (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
DATE: 7/4/16 CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE: Shri/Smt. : S.S. Dere Advocate for the Applicant Shri/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 21/4/16	Date : 7.04.2016 O.A.No.161 of 2016 Shri Kishor Hari Pimple ...Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents 1. Heard Shri S.S. Dere, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays for time for filing reply. 3. Limited questions are involved in this O.A. The Respondents are directed to show by filing affidavit any overt act on the part of Applicant in receiving the monetary benefits which are sought, unless Applicant's case will be governed by the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court, copy whereof is on record at page no.17 of this O.A. 4. Affidavit be filed before next date. 5. In view of the fact that the limited questions involved in the O.A., adjourned to 21.04.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman Sba

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015) [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

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.275 of 2016

Shri Raosaheb Shankarrao Katkar ...Applicant
Vs.
The Commissioner of Police & Ors. ...Respondents

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

2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant states that the affidavit of service would be filed during the course of the day.

3. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays for three weeks time for filing reply.

4. Time as prayed for is granted.

5. S.O. to 5.05.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

Sba

DATE : 7/4/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A.H.Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member)-A~~
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri~~/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 5/5/16

[P.T.O.

MUMBAI

: 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

.....)

versus

of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

.....)

Tribunal's orders

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.98 of 2016

Dr. Pandurang Shankar Pawar ...Applicant
Vs.
Government of Maharashtra & Ors. ....Respondents

1. Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri Lonkar prays for time to file affidavit of service.

3. Learned P.O. for the Respondents Smt. K.S. Gaikwad states that no instructions are received so far.

4. Time may be granted for filing reply.

5. In view of the earlier communications received by learned P.O. for the Respondents, P.O.'s request for granting time is refused.

6. Case will proceed without filing reply of Respondent No.1 and 2.

7. If service report is not filed the stay will be vacated.

8. S.O. to 20.04.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.M)
Chairman

sba

[P.T.O.

MBAI

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

...)

versus

Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

.....)

Tribunal's orders

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.1046 of 2015

Shri Ashish Dyandev Bankar ...Applicant
Vs.
The state of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents has tendered reply. It is taken on record.

3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri K.R. Jagdale prays for time to consider the reply and file rejoinder only if it is necessary.

4. S.O. to 14.06.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

[P.T.O.

..... Applicant/s

.....)

versus

ate of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

.....)

	Tribunal's orders

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.272 of 2015 with O.A.No.273 of 2015

Shri Dilip Popat Londhe (in O.A.No.272 of 2015)
Shri G.S. Dumbre (in O.A.No.273 of 2015)
...Applicants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri A. Apte, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Respondent No.2 is expected to pass an order as regards manner in which the period of suspension of the Applicant be dealt with.

3. In view that minor punishment has been ordered, now there should be no difficulty in taking decision.

4. Decision in this regard be taken and the same be reported on the next date.

5. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to learned P.O. for the Respondents to communicate this order to the Respondents.

6. For reporting compliance, S.O. to 10.06.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

[P.T.O.

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.
NAL

..... Applicant/s

Respondent/s

Tribunal's orders

Date : 7.04.2016

O.A.No.14 of 2016

Shri Suryabhan Manikrao Mundhe ...Applicant
Vs.
The Oivisional Commissioner & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Officer Shri Makarand Pralhad Deshmkh, Deputy Commissioner (E.G.S.), Konkan Division is present.

3. He has tendered affidavit stating that he may be granted leave to withdraw the affidavit which is at page No.40 affirmed by him dated 22.02.2016 and prays for permission to file a fresh affidavit.

4. Affidavit which is tendered today is taken on record.

5. Affidavit which is at page no.40 is stuck on record with liberty to file fresh.

6. He prays for three weeks time for filing fresh affidavit.

7. It is clarified that in the event in the matter of review of Application if the decision is in favour of the Applicant, affidavit need not be filed.

8. In the event the decision is adverse to the Applicant fresh affidavit needs to be filed.

9. S.O. to 5.05.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

[P.T.O.