

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

Tribunal's orders

Date: 17.06.2022

C.A. No.10 of 2020 in O.A. No.434 of 2014

M.C. Gosavi .....Applicant  
Versus  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ....Respondents.

1. Heard Ms Savita Suryawashi, learned Advocate holding for Shri K.R. Godbole, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. The Tribunal has passed order on 18.02.2019 directing Respondents to reinstate the Applicant with full back wages. Opportunity of conducting enquiry was also given. Review filed against the order is dismissed. The Respondent have filed Writ Petition before Hon'ble High Court in the year 2021 but there is no stay to the order passed by the Tribunal. The period of more than 3 years is over but the Applicant is not reinstated in service. As such, *prima-facie* there is contempt, <sup>Now</sup> and all the Applicant is required to take necessary steps to proceed with contempt proceeding in accordance to The Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Contempt of Courts) Rules, 1996.

3. One week time is granted to take necessary steps to the Applicant.

4. Learned P.O. sought two weeks of time to avail stay order from Hon'ble High Court. Already enough time is availed therefore this contempt proceeding is required to be proceeded with.

5. S.O. to 24.06.2022.

Sd/-

(Bijay Kumar)  
Member (A)

Sd/-

(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member (J)

NMN

\* non compliance  
of the order.  
therefore,

may consider to modify  
the draft as mentioned above  
as issue of prima facie  
contempt is to be decided  
under Rule 5 by  
appropriate authority

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 \_\_\_\_\_

IN

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
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>17.06.2022</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>M.A 352/2022 in O.A 756/2020</u></b></p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors ... Applicants (Ori Respondents) Vs. Mayawati R. Sawant &amp; Ors ... Respondents (Ori Applicants)</p> <p>1. Heard Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the applicants (Ori Respondents). None present for the Respondents (Ori Applicants).</p> <p>2. Learned C.P.O submits that the learned counsel for the Respondents (Ori Applicants) is served with the notice of the Misc Application.</p> <p>3. Misc Application is filed for extension of time for implementation of the order of this Tribunal. She further submits that Writ Petition to challenge the order of this Tribunal is ready but it is not filed. She submits that more time was consumed in translating the papers.</p> <p>4. In view of the submissions of learned C.P.O, time is granted up to 11.7.2022 to comply with the order of this Tribunal.</p> <p>5. Misc Application stands disposed of accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- <b>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</b> Chairperson</p>

Alkn

**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
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>17.06.2022</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>O.A 556/2022</u></b></p> <p>Shri Keshav S. Shengale ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri K.R Jagdale, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Archana B.K, learned P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The applicant was posted at Wadala Division and hence his transfer order is passed within one year and the applicant is due to retire on 31.12.2022.</p> <p>3. Learned P.O submits that all the facts are admitted. Learned P.O further submits that there are 11 default reports against the applicant. This fact has come before the Police Establishment Board and the Police Establishment Board has considered all these facts and hence transferred the applicant.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has given explanation to all the 11 defaults. However, the department has not replied to the same.</p> <p>5. Considering the above facts, it is necessary to have the reply on record to consider the issue of transfer.</p> <p>6. It is expected that the applicant who is in the Police Department and holding the position of Assistant Commissioner of Police to resume duty at Borivli Police Station pursuant to the transfer order dated 24.5.2022 without prejudice.</p> <p>7. Learned P.O is granted time to file reply.</p> <p>8. S.O to 7.7.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- <b>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</b> <b>Chairperson</b></p> <p style="text-align: left;">Akn</p>

**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
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>17.06.2022</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>O.A 518/2022</u></b></p> <p>Shri Harshwardhan R. Maske ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. None for the applicant. Heard Ms Archana B.K, learned P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The applicant seeks transfer according to the three options given by him at Pune, LCB and Armora.</p> <p>3. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>4. Issue notice before admission returnable on 30.6.2022.</p> <p>5. 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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p>7. 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.</p> <p>8. S.O to 30.6.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- <b>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</b> <b>Chairperson</b></p> <p>Akn</p>

**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
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>17.06.2022</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>O.A 476/2022</u></b></p> <p>Dr A.M Kadhikhaye ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri G.A Bandiwadekar, learned advocate for the applicant and Shri A.J Chougule, learned P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The applicant who retired as Medical Officer, Class-II in the year 2020, prays that he has not been paid any pension or pensionary benefits. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is no departmental enquiry pending against him till date. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that no provisional pension is paid to the applicant till date.</p> <p>3. Learned P.O submits that the Caste Certificate of the applicant is invalidated. Learned P.O seeks time to file affidavit in reply even on the point that no provisional pension is being to the applicant till date.</p> <p>4. Issue notice before admission returnable on 11.7.2022.</p> <p>5. 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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p>7. 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.</p> <p>8. S.O to 11.7.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- <b>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</b> <b>Chairperson</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">[P.T.O.]</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.560 OF 2022**

S.S. Thorat **....Applicant**  
**Vs.**  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. **....Respondents.**

Mr. K.R. Jagdale, learned Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

**CORAM** : **Justice Mridula Bhatkar, Chairperson**  
**Ms. Medha Gadgil, Member (A)**

**DATE** : **17.06.2022.**

**PER** : **Justice Mridula Bhatkar, Chairperson**

**O R D E R**

1 The Applicant working as Police Head Constable prays for directions against Respondent No.2 that the impugned charge-sheet issued to the Applicant on 20.11.2017 and the de-novo enquiry dated 29.04.2022 be quashed and set aside.

2. Learned Advocate submits that in the present case the charge sheet in de-novo enquiry issued by Respondent No.2 is served on 29.04.2022. The communication dated 06.06.2022 asking the Applicant to submit his final statement of defence before the Enquiry Officer is to be stayed. He further submits that earlier the charge-sheet was given to the Applicant on 20.11.2017. He prays that the said charge-sheet is to be quashed and set aside and the de-novo

enquiry which is initiated on 29.04.2022 is also to be quashed and set aside. He submits that after the recording of the statement in the first enquiry the Applicant has given final statement in the 1<sup>st</sup> enquiry. The Enquiry Officer has submitted his report to the Disciplinary Authority on 20.02.2019 and thereafter second enquiry has started. He submits that the charge-sheet in the first enquiry and second enquiry are same, evidence is same and so he has challenged de-novo enquiry dated 21.04.2022. Learned Advocate submits that there is delay of more than 3 years in completion of enquiry, and this has caused prejudice to the Applicant. He further submits that the Single Bench of this Tribunal by judgment dated 24.02.2022 in O.A.No.973 /2021 has revoked the suspension order of the Applicant and reinstated him. The Single Bench has directed the Disciplinary Authority to complete the D.E. within four months from the day of the said judgment.

3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant has relied on the following judgments :

- (i) **Capt.M. Paul Anthony Versus Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. & Anr. reported in 1999(82) FLR SC.**
- (ii) **Mr. S.S. Thorat Versus The Commissioner of Police, Mumbai & Ors. in O.A.No.973/2021 dated 24.02.2022.**

4. Learned C.P.O. for the Respondents submits that final report of the first Departmental Enquiry was submitted on 20.02.2019 to the Disciplinary Authority. She further submits that now on 06.06.2022 the E.O. has called upon the Applicant to give his final statement. Learned C.P.O. submits that in the judgment of this Tribunal passed

by the Single Bench no stay was granted to the de novo enquiry as the enquiry has proceeded and the Applicant has participated in the de novo enquiry. He has engaged his friend to defend him. In the present case the enquiry officer has directed the Applicant to submit his final statement. The said order passed on 06.06.2022 is under challenge. Learned C.P.O. further submits that the applicant is facing serious charges i.e. one trafficking case and preparation of false passports of 43 persons at Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj International Airport at Mumbai. She further submits that Respondents are about to complete the enquiry i.e. on 24.06.2022.

5. Learned Advocate submits that the Criminal case is also filed against the Applicant. He relied on the judgment **Capt.M. Paul Anthony Versus Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. & Anr reported in 1999(82) FLR SC**, wherein it has held that if the charges in the Criminal proceedings and D.E. are same then it is desirable to stay the Departmental proceedings till the conclusion of the Criminal case. Under such circumstance he prays that the de novo enquiry in the present O.A. be stayed.

6. After hearing learned Advocate for the Applicant and the learned C.P.O. we are of the view that the Applicant has participated in de novo enquiry and the enquiry is at the fag end and hence it is not appropriate on our part to interfere and stay the enquiry.

7. The conclusions laid down in the case of **Capt.M. Paul Anthony (supra)** nowhere it is stated that the Departmental Enquiry



(D.E.) must be stayed. However it is further stated that if at all there is delay in conclusion of the Criminal case then the Division Bench can resume and proceed with the same. In the present case though the charge-sheet was issued in the year 2017 and it will take time in the Criminal proceedings. Under such circumstances, Department is justified to proceed with the D.E. No case is made out to grant interim relief.

8. Applicant is present in the Tribunal. Learned Advocate submits that five days time is to be granted to submit final statement.

9. Learned C.P.O. has pointed out the directions of time limit framed by the Single Bench of the Tribunal. However learned Advocate Mr. Jagdale submits that the extension of time limit can be sought from the said Single Bench, however, more time is to be granted to file final statement. Under these circumstances as time is sought by the Applicant we grant time to submit final statement. However we direct the Respondent-State to get proper order of extension of time to complete the enquiry from the Hon'ble Single Bench and the Applicant to co-operate.

10. Adjourned 08.07.2022.

Sd/-

**(Medha Gadgil)**  
**Member (A)**

Sd/-

**(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**

prk

**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
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">M. A. No.333 of 2022 in O.A.No.656 of 2021</p> <p>T. T. Jadhav <span style="float:right">....Applicant</span></p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. <span style="float:right">...Respondents.</span></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Vikas Kolekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms S. P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondent No.1 and 2 and Shri V. V. Gujar, learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.3 &amp; 4.</p> <p>2. When the matter was taken up for hearing, at the very outset it is noticed that the Applicant was at the relevant time was serving as Block Development Officer, Tal. Erandol, Dist. Jalgaon. He came to be terminated by impugned order dated 30.05.2019. This being the position, O.A. ought to have been filed before the M.A.T. Bench Aurangabad which has jurisdiction over Jalgaon district. The Respondents have also raised the plea of jurisdiction in the reply.</p> <p>3. When this aspect brought to the notice to learned Counsel for the Applicant, he requested to transfer the matter to M.A.T. Bench Aurangabad since admittedly the matter pertains to M.A.T., Aurangabad.</p> <p>4. The Registrar is, therefore, directed to sent R&amp; P of M.A.as well as O.A. to M.A.T. Bench Aurangabad for the decision in accordance to law.</p>

Sd/-

(Bijay Kumar)  
Member (A)

vsm

Sd/-

(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)

[P.T.O.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O.A.No.165 of 2020</p> <p><b>N. R. Raut</b> <span style="float: right;">...Applicant</span>  <b>Versus</b>  <b>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors.</b> <span style="float: right;">...Respondents.</span></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</li> <li>2. The Applicant is Head Constable and was subjected to punishment of dismissal from service by the Respondent No.3 – Inspector General of Police by order dated 15.01.2019.</li> <li>3. Being aggrieved by it, he had filed appeal before the Director General of Police i.e. Respondent No.4 which came to be dismissed on 21.01.2020. It is against these orders, the Applicant has filed present O.A.</li> <li>4. Learned Counsel for the Applicant has pointed out that there was joint inquiry against the Applicant and one Shri Gujare, Head Constable. He was also dismissed from the service and appeal also came to be dismissed. However, he preferred revision before the Government which came to be allowed partly by order dated 11.11.2020 and the order of dismissal from service was set aside and punishment of withholding of increment for two years without cumulative effect was imposed.</li> <li>5. Thus, co-delinquent got some relief in revision. However, present Applicant has not preferred revision and directly filed this O.A.</li> <li>6. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that he wants to take instructions from his client about availing the remedy of revision so that he could get similar relief by the Government in revision.</li> <li>7. Learned Counsel for the Applicant has also submits that in fact the role played by present Applicant was not sufficient to implicate him in criminal or D.E. This aspect can be dealt with during the course of hearing on merit.</li> <li>8. On request of learned Counsel for the Applicant, two days time is granted to take instructions from his client about availing remedy of revision.</li> <li>9. S.O. to 20.06.2022.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/-</span>  <span style="display: block; text-align: center;">v</span> <span style="display: block; text-align: center;">v</span>  <b>(Bijay Kumar)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(A.P. Kurhekar)</b></span>  <b>Member (A)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Member(J)</b></span></p> <p style="text-align: center;">vsm</p>

**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								
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>OA.207/2022 with OA.909/2021 and OA.141/2022 with O.A. No.292 of 2022</u></p> <p>D.N. Gutte &amp; 24 Ors. A.M. Chandanshiv V.S. Tengale A.R. Kende ..Applicants                                 Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors.                 ..Respondents</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for Applicants in OA.207/2022 and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Shri U.V. Bhosle, learned Advocate for the Applicants in OAs.909/2021 &amp; 141/2022 and Shri Y.B. Lengare, learned Advocate for Applicant in OA No.292 of 2022 are not present.</p> <p>3. Shri Sandeep Dere, Ld. Advocate submits that he has obtained NOC and will be filing his Vakalatnama in OAs. No.909/2021 &amp; 141/2022 on behalf of the applicants.</p> <p>4. Ld. CPO states that reply will be filed during the course of the day.</p> <p>5. S.O. to 24.6.2022. Interim relief to continue.</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Sd/-</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Sd/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Member (A)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Chairperson</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">17.6.2022</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17.6.2022</td> </tr> </table> </div> <p>(sgj)</p>	Sd/-	Sd/-	(Medha Gadgil)	(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)	Member (A)	Chairperson	17.6.2022	17.6.2022
Sd/-	Sd/-								
(Medha Gadgil)	(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)								
Member (A)	Chairperson								
17.6.2022	17.6.2022								

**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
	<p align="center"><u>O.A. No.483 of 2022</u></p> <p>Magan G. Prajapat ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Ms. Savita Suryavanshi, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Not on board. Taken on board immediately at the request of Ld. Advocate for the applicant.</p> <p>3. Ld. Advocate for the applicant files Purshis dated 17.6.2022 stating that the order dated 24.5.2022 passed by this Tribunal in the above OA directing the respondents no.2 and 3 to keep one post of Police Constable from OBC category vacant till next date, is not obeyed.</p> <p>4. Ld. CPO is directed to bring this order and the order dated 24.5.2022 to the notice of Commissioner of Police, Thane.</p> <p>5. S.O to 4.7.2022. Hamdast.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- _____ Sd/- _____ (Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson 17.6.2022 17.6.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>

**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
	<p align="center"><u>M.A. No.355 of 2022 in O.A. No.946 of <del>2022</del> 2016</u></p> <p>V. B. Salunke ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Ms. Savita Suryavanshi holding for Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>3. Issue notice before admission in MA returnable on 8.7.2022. The respondents are directed to file reply.</p> <p>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 MA &amp; OA. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/-</span></p> <p align="center">(Medha Gadgil) <span style="float: right;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</span> Member (A) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span> 17.6.2022 <span style="float: right;">17.6.2022</span></p> <p>(sgj)</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>M.A. No.300 of 2022 in O.A. No.484 of 2022</u></p> <p>D.D. Kasab ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Ms. Savita Suryavanshi holding for Ms. Prachi Hendre, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Ld. PO submits that there is no delay in the matter as the communication was issued on 14.1.2022. Ld. PO to verify the same.</p> <p>3. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>4. Issue notice before admission in MA returnable on 1.7.2022. The respondents are directed to file reply.</p> <p>5. 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 MA &amp; OA. 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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p>7. 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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/-</span></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil) <span style="float: right;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</span></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (A) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p> <p style="text-align: center;">17.6.2022 <span style="float: right;">17.6.2022</span></p> <p>(sgj)</p>

**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
	<p><b>Date : 17.06.2022</b></p> <p><b>O.A.No.759 of 2018</b></p> <p>Dr. S.M. Kaul .....Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. We are informed that learned Advocate Mr. J.N. Kamble is no more and therefore the Registry (Judicial Section) is directed to issue notice to Applicant Dr. S.M. Kaul and direct him to remain present himself or to engage Advocate of his choice.</p> <p>3. Adjourned to 08.07.2022.</p> <p>Sd/- <b>(Medha Gadgil)</b> Member(A)</p> <p>Sd/- <b>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</b> Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>



**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
	<p><b>Date : 17.06.2022</b></p> <p align="center"><b>O.A.No.23 of 2019</b></p> <p>Dr. N.L. Chutke .....Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned Advocate Mr. S.P. Wasnik is not present. Matter is fixed on 30.06.2022 to enable him to appear.</p> <p>3. Adjourned to 30.06.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- _____ Sd/- _____</p> <p align="center">(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member(A) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

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

Tribunal's orders

Date : 17.06.2022

O.A.No.69 of 2018

R.N. Pawar .....Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ....Respondents.

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

2. The Applicant working as Senior Clerk in the office of Joint Commissioner, Food and Drugs Administration, Nashik Division, Nashik has challenged the order dated 25.10.2017 informing the Applicant that in his re-verification of the paper he has failed and his prayer that the Principal himself to re-verify the paper cannot be entertained as the Principal is an expert in Medicine and not in the subject of the 'Conduct, (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1979' (with Books)

3. The Applicant has failed in the said subject by securing 33% whereas the requirement for passing is 40%. The Applicant contends that he should have secured 58%. His paper was re-verified and the result was maintained so he made application again for re-valuation which was denied by the letter dated 25.10.2017.

3. At the request of learned Advocate adjourned to 01.07.2022.

Sd/-

(Medha Gadgil)  
Member(A)

prk

Sd/-

(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)  
Chairperson

**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
	<p><b>Date : 17.06.2022</b></p> <p><b>O.A.No.297 of 2022</b></p> <p>S.R. Jadhav .....Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. V.B. Dhage, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents</p> <p>2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that this Tribunal by judgment dated 11.04.2022 in O.A.No.144/2022 and Ors. (Mr. Amit H. Daphal &amp; Ors. Versus The Superintendent of Police &amp; Ors.) has taken particular view which goes against the prayer of the present Applicant and therefore appropriate orders may be passed.</p> <p>3. Learned C.P.O. for the Respondents submits that in view of the said judgment dated 11.04.2022 which is contrary to the relief prayer by the Applicant in present O.A. nothing remains in this O.A. and the same can be disposed of.</p> <p>4. In view of the submissions of learned Advocate and learned C.P.O., O.A. is disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p>(Medha Gadgil) Member(A)</p> <p>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A. No.616 of 2019</u></p> <p>R.R. Divekar &amp; 2 Ors. ..Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. . . . . ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri M.B. Kadam, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The applicants pray that recommendation letter dated 24.5.2019 issued by MPSC by which list of selected candidates to the post of Town Planner, Grade-A, (Gazetted) be declared illegal and bad in law qua respondents no.3 to 8 and it is to be quashed and set aside and the merit list dated 24.5.2019 be quashed and set aside.</p> <p>3. Ld. Advocate for the applicants pray that the migration should not have been allowed on the basis of earlier judgments in OAs. No.389/2018 &amp; Group Nayna R. Valkunde Vs. State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. dated 8.5.2019.</p> <p>4. Ld. CPO pointed out that the cause of action does not survive in view of the settled law of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as the matter in respect of migration in horizontal reservation is settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Saurav Yadav Vs. The State of U.P.&amp; Ors. SLP No.23223 of 2018 decided on 18.12.2020.</p> <p>5. Ld. Advocate for the applicants submit that Applicant No.1-Mr. Rahul Ramdas Divekar and Applicant No.2-Mr. Raturaj Abhimanyu Jadhav are to be deleted from the title of this OA. Applicants No.1 and 2 are deleted.</p> <p>6. In view of the statements of Ld. Advocate for the applicants and Ld. PO nothing survives in this OA. OA is disposed off accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p>(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson 17.6.2022 17.6.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>

**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
	<p align="center"><b>Date: 17.06.2022</b></p> <p align="center"><b>O.A. No.588 of 2019</b></p> <p><b>M.B. Sonawane</b> .....Applicant  <b>Versus</b>  <b>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors.</b> .....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri Sanjay Kulkarni, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Indeed this matter was heard for more than 45 minutes yesterday and today arguments of learned Advocate for the Applicant was to be continued.</p> <p>3. When today we have taken up for hearing learned P.O. has tendered order dated 26.03.2021 passed by the Government thereby rejecting the claim of the Applicant for extension of age as well as recommendation of U.G.C. The order dated 26.03.2021 is taken on record and marked by letter 'A' for identification.</p> <p>4. Therefore P.O. submits that matter has become infructuous since there is already decision taken by the Government.</p> <p>5. Indeed, copy of the order dated 26.03.2021 has been already received by the Applicant which she admits when asked by the Tribunal. However, she stated she has not appraise about order dated 26.03.2021 to her Counsel. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri Sanjay Kulkarni therefore submits that for the first time today he got knowledge about the order dated 26.03.2021.</p>

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

**Tribunal's orders**

6. Indeed, such order ought to have been brought to the notice of the Tribunal much earlier. Even yesterday also this aspect was not brought to the notice of the Tribunal, when specific query was raised to the learned P.O., she submits that she too was not aware of the order and today only the Department has given order dated 26.03.2021 to her. Indeed, there was a communication to the said order to the office of P.O. but it seems to have been not brought to the notice of P.O.

7. In sofaras this O.A. is concerned the learned Advocate for the Applicant in view of order dated 26.03.2021 seeks permission to withdraw O.A. with liberty to file fresh O.A. to challenge order dated 26.03.2021.

8. Liberty is granted to withdraw O.A. to file fresh O.A. for challenging order dated 26.03.2021. All contention are kept open.

9. O.A. is disposed of with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Bijay Kumar)  
Member (A)

Sd/-

(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member (J)

NMN

**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
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.291 of 2020</p> <p>S. R. Sutar .....Applicant</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ...Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri R. M. Kolge, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B. K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. On request of learned Counsel for the Applicant, two days time is granted for final hearing.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 20.06.2022.</p> <p>Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p>vsm</p> <p>Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)</p>

# 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
	<p style="text-align: center;">Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O.A. No.224 of 2022</p> <p>S.H. Nikat .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Savita Suryawanshi, learned Advocate holding for Smt P.H. Hendre, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. This O.A. has been filed along with M.A. No.136/2022 for condonation of delay which disposed of today by separate order passed in M.A. Therefore this O.A. is required to be decided on its own merit. Since, learned P.O. is already representing Respondents and stated to waive of notices, it is not necessary to issue notices.</p> <p>3. Four weeks time is granted to file Affidavit-in-Reply to O.A.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 12.07.2022.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/-</p> <p>(Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/-</p> <p>(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> </div> </div> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">NMN</p>



**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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p>M.A. No.161 of 2022 in O.A. No.61 of 2021</p> <p>S.S. Choudhari .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Applicant and his Advocate both are absent.</p> <p>2. Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>3. This M.A. is filed to initiate contempt proceeding for non compliance of the order passed by the Tribunal on 09.03.2021 &amp; 21.09.2021.</p> <p>4. Indeed, instead of filing M.A. the Applicant ought to have filed contempt proceeding. Be that as it may, learned P.O. submits that the orders of the Tribunal are already complied with.</p> <p>5. Learned Advocate for the Applicant has already tendered withdrawal pursis along with letter of the Applicant.</p> <p>6. In view of above, since O.A. No.61/2022 is already disposed, M.A. No.161/2022 is disposed of with no order as to costs.</p> <p>Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p>Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p>O.A. No.241 of 2022</p> <p>S.S. Bansode .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. On request of learned P.O. two weeks time is granted to file Affidavit-in-Reply.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 30.06.2022.</p> <p>Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p>Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

# 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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O.A. No.245 of 2017</p> <p>R.R. Rathod .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applicant and his Advocate both are absent.</li> <li>2. Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents is present.</li> <li>3. On perusal of record reveals that the Applicant and his Advocate both were absent on last date and matter was adjourned to give one opportunity to the Applicant.</li> <li>4. However, today again Applicant and his Advocate both are absent, it seems that they are not interest in the matter. Hence, O.A. is dismissed in default with no order as to costs.</li> </ol> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/-</p> <p>(Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/-</p> <p>(A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> </div> </div> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">NMN</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p><b>Date: 17.06.2022</b></p> <p><b>M.A. No.136 of 2022 in O.A. No.224 of 2022</b></p> <p><b>S.H. Nikat .....Applicant</b>  <b>Versus</b>  <b>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</b></p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Savita Suryawanshi, learned Advocate holding for Smt P.H. Hendre, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. This M.A. is filed for stating there is delay of condonation of 1 year and 11 months and prayed to condone the delay caused in filing O.A. for grant of 3<sup>rd</sup> Time Bound Promotion.</p> <p>3. On perusal of record it reveals that in fact there is no delay of 1 year and 11 months as stated in M.A. and Application seems to have been filed in wrong conception. It may be noted that the Applicant stands retired as Jr. Clerk on 31.05.2021 and O.A. is filed well within 1 year on 09.03.2022. The Applicant claim is for 3<sup>rd</sup> Time Bound Promotion on the basis of latest G.R. issued by the Government on 02.03.2019 whereby the claim of Time Bound Promotion has revised scheme and 3<sup>rd</sup> Time Bound Promotion is made admissible to the candidates who are entitled to it in terms of the condition mentioned in G.R. This being so, it was for the Department to consider his case and to pass appropriate order but Department seems to have not considered it though Applicant retired on 31.05.2021. The Applicant has also issued notice on 21.01.2022.</p> <p>4. As such, in our considered opinion there is no delay in filing O.A.</p> <p>5. Learned P.O. also fairly stated that appropriate order be passed.</p> <p>6. In view of above, M.A. is allowed and disposed of with no order as to costs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/-</span></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Bijay Kumar) <span style="float: right;">(A.P. Kurhekar)</span>  Member (A) <span style="float: right;">Member (J)</span></p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI**

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

of 20

IN

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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">C.A. No.61 of 2019 in O.A. No.975 of 2018</p> <p>B.S. Lambhate .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri Gaurav A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that order passed by the Tribunal is complied with and Applicant has received all the service benefits. He therefore requested to disposed of C.A.</p> <p>3. In view of above, C.A. is disposed of with no order as to costs.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p align="center">NMN</p>

**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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p>M.A. No.106 of 2022 in O.A. No.806 of 2020</p> <p>G.B. Pilgar .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri V.P. Potbhare, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. This M.A. is filed for direction to the Respondents not to proceed with process of promotion.</p> <p>3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that since O.A. is already ripe for hearing, M.A. be also heard along with O.A.</p> <p>4. Since, O.A. pertain to issue of promotion matter be kept before concerned Bench for Final Hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**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
	<p>Date: 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">M.A. No.337 of 2017 in O.A. No.35 of 2017</p> <p>S.A. Adake .....Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ....Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. On request of learned Advocate for the Applicant adjourned for hearing of M.A.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 22.06.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p align="center">NMN</p>

**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
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A.No.158 of 2019</p> <p>S. R. Putta <span style="float:right">....Applicant</span></p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. <span style="float:right">...Respondents.</span></p> <p>1. Heard Shri G. A. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Perusal of record reveals that the matter was lying undated in the office and today for the first time, it is listed for final hearing.</p> <p>3. Therefore, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned for final hearing.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 08.07.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- <span style="float:right">Sd/-</span></p> <p align="center">(Bijay Kumar) <span style="float:right">(A.P. Kurhekar)</span></p> <p align="center">Member (A) <span style="float:right">Member(J)</span></p> <p align="center">vsm</p>



**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
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A.No.546 of 2019</p> <p>A. J. Sawant <span style="float:right">....Applicant</span></p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. <span style="float:right">...Respondents.</span></p> <p>1. Heard Shri G. A. Bandiwadekar, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Perusal of record reveals that the matter was lying undated in the office and today for the first time, it is listed for final hearing.</p> <p>3. Therefore, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned for final hearing.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 08.07.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- <span style="float:right">Sd/-</span>  (Bijay Kumar) <span style="float:right">(A.P. Kurhekar)</span>  Member (A) <span style="float:right">Member(J)</span></p> <p>vsm</p>

**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
	<p>Date : 17.06.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A.No.1234 of 2019</p> <p>Dr. D. S. Sawant <span style="float:right">....Applicant</span></p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. <span style="float:right">...Respondents.</span></p> <p>1. The Applicant and his Counsel both are absent. Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Perusal of record reveals that the matter was lying undated in the office and today for the first time, it is listed for final hearing.</p> <p>3. Therefore, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned for final hearing to give one opportunity to Applicant and his Counsel.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 04.07.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (Bijay Kumar) Member (A)</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member(J)</p> <p>vsm</p>

**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
	<p align="center"><u>M.A. No.75 of 2022 in O.A. No.125 of 2022</u></p> <p>Dr. N.S. Bambale ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, learned Advocate for the Applicant, Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for Respondents and Snehal Gawade, learned Advocate for Respondent No.4.</p> <p>2. Ld. PO seeks three weeks time to file reply.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 8.7.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) // Member (A) 17.6.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>

**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
	<u>O.As. No.396 &amp; 397 of 2022</u>
	<p>Rajendra S. Kajale Ajay B. Gangurde Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors.</p> <p align="right">..Applicants ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri G.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Pursuant to order dated 2.5.2022, Ld. PO submits that retirement dues like Gratuity, GPF, Leave Encashment and provision pension up to July, 2020 has been paid.</p> <p>3. Ld. PO on instructions from the officers present in the Court Shri Anil Tidme, Office Superintendent, Social Welfare Office, Nashik, submits that proposal for getting approval to the provisional pension has been sent to the office of Accountant General.</p> <p>4. The respondents are directed to take proactive steps to get the matter approved within one week.</p> <p>5. S.O. to 24.6.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (Medha/Gadgaj) Member (A) 17.6.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>


**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
	<p align="center"><u>O.A. No.578 of 2022</u></p> <p>R.B. Kale ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri S.S. Dere, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The applicant challenges his non-selection in main examination of PSI, STI and ASO. The applicant states that he has got more marks than the cutoff for the STI. However, he was not permitted to apply for further selection.</p> <p>3. Ld. CPO produces copy of application form filled in by the applicant wherein he has not given choice for the post of STI. Copy of application form is taken on record and marked Exhibit '1' for identification.</p> <p>4. Applicant is personally present in the Court. In view of this fact the Ld. Advocate for the applicant, in presence of the applicant and with his consent, seeks permission to withdraw this OA.</p> <p>5. The comments of the applicant to the media stating that he was not called upon for interview by MPSC and its criticism should be not be considered as disqualification for further application by the applicant and MPSC should not keep hostile attitude towards the candidate.</p> <p>6. In view of the above, OA is allowed to be withdrawn and disposed off as such.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/- </span></p> <p align="center">(Medha Gadgil) <span style="float: right;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</span> Member (A) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span> 17.6.2022 <span style="float: right;">17.6.2022</span></p> <p>(sgi)</p>

**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
	<p align="center"><u>O.A. No.517 of 2022</u></p> <p>A.P. Jogdand ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra &amp; Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. None for the applicant.</p> <p>2. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>3. Issue notice before admission returnable on 15.7.2022. The respondents are directed to file reply.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- <span style="float: right;">Sd/-</span></p> <p align="center">(Medha Gadgil) <span style="float: right;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.)</span> Member (A) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span> 17.6.2022 <span style="float: right;">17.6.2022</span></p> <p>(sgj)</p>