..... Applica.

(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 : 8.7.16

CORAM :

~~Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Shri R.B. Malik (Member)~~A~~ J

APPEARANCE :

Shri/Smt. : Heard Appl. in person.

Advocate for the Applicant,

Shri/Smt. : N.K. Rajpurohit

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

Adj. To 15.7.16.

O.A.412/2016

Smt. S.S. Kamble ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Applicant in person and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

The learned CPO submits that they shall furnish to the Applicant un-affirmed copy of the Affidavit-in-reply during the course of the day. The next date is being appointed for arguments and if the Affidavit-in-reply is filed before the arguments commenced, it will be taken on record. The Applicant may also file the Affidavit-in-rejoinder, if so advised.

S.O. to 15th July, 2016.

8.7.16

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
08.07.2016

(skw)

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

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

08.07.2016

O.A No 608/2016

Shri S.B Jadhav ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors... Respondents

Heard Shri S.S Dere, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Neelima Gohad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Learned Presenting Officer informs that the Applicant's request for keeping him in Solapur as he is retiring within one year has been rejected. She stated that affidavit in rely will be filed within one week.

It was expected that affidavit in reply would be filed today because there was no connection between the request of the applicant being considered and the filing of the affidavit. Last chance is granted to the Respondents to file affidavit in reply and if no reply is filed, it will be presumed that the Respondents have nothing to say in the matter and the matter will be heard finally.

S.O 15.7.2016.

Sd/-
(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

Akn

DATE: 8/7/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL
(Vice - Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)~~
APPEARANCE:
Shri/~~Smt.~~ S.S. Dere
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ Ms. N.G. Gohad
~~C.P.O.~~/P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. to~~ S.O. to 15/7/16.

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

Date : 08.07.2016.

O.A.No.409 of 2016

Shri K.G. Sarang ...Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned C.P.O. for the Respondents on instructions received from the Respondents prays for time for filing affidavit.

3. Four weeks time may be granted.

4. Though four weeks time is prayed six weeks time is granted with the caution that no further adjournment will be granted.

5. It is hoped that the case would be seen by the Government after taking into consideration following points:-

(a) The case is closed on A summary.

(b) The Competent Authority did not initiate any Departmental Enquiry.

(c) Unless the Applicant is dealt with in accordance with the rulesand procedure governed in the disciplinary matters, his service could not be dispensed with and impugned order needs to be viewed from the point of view of law and justice.

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

7. S.O. to 30.08.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

DATE: 8/7/16
COR:
H: R.B. Malik (Chairman)
S: M.D. Lonkar
Shri: N.K. Rajpurohit
C.P.O.
Adj. To 30/8/16.
Steno copy & Hamdast allowed to ld. P.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 8/7/16 Coram: (Chairman) (Member)A Appearance Shri C.T. Chandratre Advocate Shri Archana B.K. C.P. Adj. to.... OA is disposed of sba	**Date : 08.07.2016.** **O.A.No.672 of 2016** **Shri Y.A. Kale ...Applicant** **Vs.** **Sub Divisional Officer, Yeola Sub Division, Tal. Yeola, Dist. Nashik ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondent. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents has tendered affidavit of the Respondent to the effect that the order which is at page no.8, Exh. 'A-1' dated 20.06.2016 will be withdrawn. 3. Applicant will be given notice and appropriate order. 4. Original Application is disposed of. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman

[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: 8/7/16 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.: N.G. Gohad C.P.O. / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 18/8/16.	**Date : 08.07.2016.** **O.A.No.128 of 2016** **Shri U.M. Tirodkar ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents Ms. N.G. Gohad prays for two weeks time. 3. Though two weeks time is prayed, four weeks time is granted by way of last chance. 4. S.O. to 18.08.2016. sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman sba

[P.T.O.

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

O.A.671/2016

Mrs. Padmini P. Puranik ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri Indrajeet Kulkarni, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. A.B. Kololgi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Issue notice returnable on 22.07.2016.

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

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.

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.

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 four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

S.O. to 22nd July, 2016. The learned P.O. do waive service.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik) 08.07.16
Member (J)
08.07.2016

(skw)

DATE : 8/7/16
CORAM :
~~Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R.B. Malik (Member) ~~A~~
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : Indrajeet Kulkarni
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. : A.B. Kololgi
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 22/7/16.

(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.294/2012**
DATE: 8/7/16 CORAM: Hon'ble (Chairman) Hon'ble Shri R.B. Kololgi (Member) A J ADMISSION: Shri Hon'ble for the app. ADMISSION/INTERIM RELIEF: Shri A.B. Kololgi ..... C.P.O./P.O. for the respondent/s Adj. To 29/7/16	**Shri S.N. Hange ... Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents** Applicant and Advocate absent. Heard Smt. A.B. Kololgi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. See the order dated 23rd June, 2016. The OA has already proceeded without reply. Adjourned for hearing and order, failing which for dismissal. S.O. to 29th July, 2016. Sd/- (R.B. Malik) Member (J) 08.07.2016 (skw)

[P.T.O.

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

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

08.07.2016

R.A 13/2010 in O.A 1132/2015

Shri A.R Chavan ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors... Respondents

1. Heard applicant in person and Ms Neelima Gohad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice before admission made returnable on 22.7.2016.

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 Respondent intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Respondent is 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 22.7.2016

Sd/-
(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

Akn

DATE : 8/7/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL
(Vice - Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)~~
APPEARANCES :
~~Shri~~ Applicant in person.
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri~~ Ms. N. G. Gohad
~~C.P.O~~ P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 22/7/16.

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

08.07.2016

O.A Nos 617, 618, 619 & 620/2016

Shri E.J Shiledar & ors ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors... Respondents

Heard Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the applicant and Smt Kranti S. Gaikwad learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Learned Presenting Officer request for time to file affidavit in reply. One week's time is granted to the Respondents to file reply.

S.O to 14.7.2016.

Sd/-
(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

Akn

DATE : 8/7/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL
(Vice - Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)~~
APPEARANCES :
~~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 14/7/16.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION 507 OF 2016

DISTRICT : PUNE

Shri H.B. Rajage)...**Applicant**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others)...**Respondents**

Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the Applicants.

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

CORAM : Shri Rajiv Agarwal (Vice-Chairman)

DATE : 08.07.2016

O R D E R

1. Heard Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the Applicants and Smt Kranti S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. This matter was heard initially on 6.6.2016. This Tribunal did not grant any inter relief hoping and believing that the matter can be decided at an early date and with that view in mind the Respondents were asked to file their affidavit in reply ~~at at ea~~ date. Sufficient time of more than 3 weeks was granted to the Respondents to enable them to file reply in the matter. On the

next date however, no affidavit was forthcoming and learned P.O has requested for one weeks time. Last chance was given to the Respondents to file reply and the matter was kept along with similar matters further hearing. Today neither affidavit in reply is filed nor record of the proceedings of the Police Establishment Board are brought for the perusal of this Tribunal.

3. I was inclined to impose costs on the Respondents. However, learned P.O stated that four O.As (O.A no 663, 664, 665 & 666/2016) have been heard today by the bench headed by the Hon'ble Chairman, where persons, who were similarly placed, have been transferred by the said authority and Hon'ble Chairman has passed the following order:-

> "13. In this background it is considered necessary that the Commissioner of Police as well as Additional Commissioner of Police should file their own affidavit on following grounds:-
>
> (a) Whether they have acquainted themselves with Section 22N of the Bombay Police Act.
>
> (b) Whether they have read the said Section 22N before taking decision as recorded in the minutes dated 26.5.2016.
>
> (c) In which of the clause or clauses of Section 22N, the impugned transfer is permissible.
>
> (d) The facts which constituted the grounds and circumstances leading to the decision to transfer, do fit in to a particulars prescribed by Section 22N enabling the Transfer.

4. Learned Presenting Officer stated that the same is being communicated to the Respondents for further action and it is expected that if Section 22N of the Maharashtra Police Act has not been applied properly in this case, the transfer orders will be withdrawn. In view of this fact, the Respondents are directed to

file affidavit in reply on similar lines as asked by the Hon'ble Chairman in the above mentioned O.As.

5. S.O to 18.7.2016. Hamdast.

(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

Place : Mumbai
Date : 08.07.2016
Dictation taken by : A.K. Nair.

H:\Anil Nair\Judgments\2016\1st July 2016\O.A 507.16 Transfer order challenged SB.0716 Int order.doc

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 663 of 2016 To 666 OF 2016

DISTRICT :Pune

Shri G.H. Pawar (O.A.No.663 of 2016)
Shri C.D. Mundhe (O.A.No.664 of 2016)
Shri G.A. Jagtap (O.A.No.665 of 2016)
Shri A.N. Khude (O.A.No.666 of 2016) ...Applicants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

Smt. P. Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant.

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

CORAM : Shri J. A.H. Joshi, Chairman.

DATE : 08.07.2016

ORDER

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

2. Issue notice returnable on 18.07.2016.

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

4. 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.. 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. Crucial ground raised in O.A. is ground No.6.10.1, 6.10.4 and 6.10.9

8. Copy of minutes which has led to issuance of transfer order dated 26.05.2016 is tendered for perusal.

9. It is seen that the minutes are signed by 4 officers, who are the members of the Police Establishment Board concerned.

10. Two amongst those officers are Additional Commissioner of Police and Commissioner of Police, Pune who must be very Senior Officers, and other two are junior level officers as compared to these two officers.

11. On enquiry by this Tribunal learned P.O. for the Respondents told that the Commissioner of Police is in the rank of Additional Director General of Police and Additional Commissioner of Police is in the rank of Deputy Inspector General of Police.

12. The text of the order or minutes do not disclose the reason and grounds particularly with specific reference to the contents prescribed and described in proviso to Sub Section (1) of Section 22 N or Sub Section (2) thereof.

13. In this background it is considered necessary that the Commissioner of Police as well as Additional Commissioner of Police should file their own affidavit on following points:-

(a) Whether they have acquainted themselves with Section 22N of the Bombay Police Act.

(b) Whether they have read the said Section 22N before taking decision as recorded in the minutes dated 26.05.2016.

(c) In which of the clause or clauses of Section 22N, the impugned transfer is permissible.

(d) The facts which constituted the grounds and circumstances leading to the decision to transfer, do fit in to a particulars prescribed by Section 22N enabling the Transfer.

14. Own Affidavit by these two officers, and not of any other subordinate officer, be filed on or before 18.07.2016.

15. It shall not be necessary to file affidavit by these offices, if Respondent No.2 on consideration of the matter is satisfied that the impugned order do not fit in the provisions of law, and decide to withdraw those, and in this event they would enjoy liberty to pass orders afresh, in accordance with law.

16. Learned P.O. for the Respondents states that the officer who is present will take the P.O.'s letter and copy of the order to ensure its communication to Respondents No.2 and the Additional Commissioner of Police, Pune for compliance.

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

18. S.O. to 18.07.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATIONS 612 & 613/2016

DISTRICT : PUNE

1. Shri S.B. Landge O.A no 612/2016)
2. Shri S.E Pawale O.A no 613/2016)...**Applicants**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Others)...**Respondents**

Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the Applicants.

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

CORAM : Shri Rajiv Agarwal (Vice-Chairman)

DATE : 08.07.2016

O R D E R

1. Heard Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the Applicants and Smt Kranti S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Advocate Mrs Mahajan states that the matter was last heard on 24.6.2016. With a view to expeditiously decide this Original Application, it was directed that the reply may be filed by the Respondents on the next date. Two weeks time was granted. However, no reply is forthcoming nor the record has been brought for the perusal of this Tribunal. In the order dated 24.6.2016, liberty was given to the Applicants to revive the prayer for interim relief, in case reply is not filed.

3. As affidavit in reply is not filed, learned advocate Mrs Mahajan was heard on the issue of interim relief. Learned Advocate

Mrs Mahajan stated that the Applicants have been transferred before they could complete their tenure of five years. The Applicants are in the rank of Police Constable / Head Constable and are entitled under Sec 22N of the Maharashtra Police Act for a tenure of five years at one Police Station. However, without complying with the conditions mentioned in Section 22N of the Maharashtra Police Act, they have been transferred before completion of their tenure by the order dated 26.5.2016 & 28.5.2016.

4. Prima facie, contention of the learned Advocate Mrs Mahajan appears to be correct. On perusal of the order it is seen that no specific reasons for transfer of these applicants before completion of their tenure have been mentioned in the order. Prima facie, transfer orders have been issued without complying with the provisions of the Sec 22 of the Maharashtra Police Act.

5. In view of the failure of the Respondents to file affidavit in reply as directed by this Tribunal within time, the interim relief as sought by the Applicants is granted. The transfer orders dated 26.5.20116 & 28.5.2016, qua the Applicants are hereby stayed. The Applicants will be allowed to work in the post where they were working before the transfer orders were issued. This should be done within a period of one week.

6. Learned P.O seeks two weeks time to file reply. S.O to 18.7.2016. Hamdast and Steno copy allowed.

(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

Place : Mumbai
Date : 08.07.2016
Dictation taken by : A.K. Nair.
H:\Anil Nair\Judgments\2016\1st July 2016\O.A nos 612 and 613.16 Int order.doc

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

O.A.898/15

Shri M.R. Gholap ... Applicant
V/s.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri L.S. Deshmukh, the learned Advocate for the and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Shri Deshmukh, the learned Advocate has just about opened his arguments. It appears that under prayer Clause (b), a G.R. of 30th December, 2013 is challenged on the anvil of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It is apparently a matter of some moment but somehow or the other, the Respondents have thought it fit to rest content by filing only an Affidavit-in-reply of Deputy Director of Sports while Respondent No.1 – State of Maharashtra through Secretary, School Education and Sports Department and also the Home Department and also the parties. Naturally, if a G.R. is questioned as to its constitutional validity, it will be necessary for the Government to file a proper Affidavit. Were the Government to fail to comply with our directions to file an Affidavit-in-reply on the next date, we shall have no other-go but to proceed on the assumption that they have made peace with the challenge to the said G.R. We also direct a letter of request to be sent to the learned Advocate General in as much as a Government instrument is being challenged.

Adjourned to 5th August, 2016. Hamdast.

Sd/- 08.07.16
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
08.07.2016

Sd/-
(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman
08.07.2016

(skw)

DATE: 8/7/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Shri RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
Shri/Smt. L.S. Deshmukh
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. N.G. Gohad
C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondents
Adj. To 5/8/16.
Hamdast.

..... 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.875/15**

Shri G.R. Alone & 1 Anr. ... Applicants
V/s.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

Smt. Gaikwad, the learned P.O. is being instructed by Mr. S.V. Dhandore, Desk Officer, Revenue & Forest Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai.

We regret to mention that although this matter was debated for quite some length and we expected a Senior Officer to at least remain present to answer some of the vital queries, ultimately a Desk Officer has been deputed. He were so minded as to impose a really prohibitory cost ~~as~~ or close the matter as it were as far as this aspect of this concerned. However, the learned P.O. makes an earnest request to grant her at least one working days time to file the Affidavit-in-reply of the Principal Secretary, Revenue & Forest Department, Mantralaya.

Adjourned to 12th July, 2016. Hamdast.

Sd/- 08.07.16
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
08.07.2016

Sd/-
(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman
08.07.2016

(skw)

DATE: 8/7/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ M.D. Lonkar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ K.S. Gaikwad
~~C.P.O./P.O.~~ for the Respondents
~~Adj to~~ 12/7/16
Hamdast.
HOB