ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 602/2021 (Pravin Narayan Nemade Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri HV Patil, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri SK Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

2. The applicant retired from the Government services on 31.5.2018. At the time of his retirement the applicant was working on the post of Sectional Engineer. The applicant was initially appointed as Jr. Engineer (Electrical) on 30.10.1981. Later on the applicant was promoted as Sectional Engineer in April, 1991. He served on the said post till his superannuation on 31.5.2018. While due for superannuation his pension proposal was forwarded by the Department and pension was finalized by the respondent no. 5, the Accountant General on 16.4.2018. Later on, respondent no. 3, the Chief Electrical Inspector, Industry, Energy and Labour Department, Mumbai vide his letter dated 19.5.2018, informed respondent no. 2 that the

benefit of Assured Career Progression Scheme (for short the benefit of ACP Scheme) was wrongly given to the applicant on 1.8.2001 instead of 1.4.2003 i.e. before completion of 12 years service. Accordingly the applicant's pay was re-fixed giving 1st benefit of ACP scheme from 1.3.2003 and his provisional monthly pension was fixed as Rs. 15,940/-. Respondent no. 4, then recovered the amount of Rs. 3,87,000/-, allegedly paid in excess of the entitlement of the applicant as was detected in his pay verification.

3. The aforesaid order has been challenged by the applicant in the present OA. The order has been challenged mainly on the ground that no such recovery could have been made by the respondents after retirement of the applicant, which was pertaining to the period more than 5 years preceding to date of his retirement. The learned counsel has relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 11527/2014 arising out of S.L.P. (C) No. 11684/2012 & Ors. (State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc.) reported at AIR 2015 SC 596 to

support his contentions. Reliance is also placed by the learned counsel on the judgment delivered by the principal seat of this tribunal at Mumbai in the case of Shri Shakil Isaque Shaikh Vs. the Director General of Police, Mumbai & Another in O.A. No. 401/2019 on 12.3.2021. He has also cited the order passed by this Tribunal in the case of Gautam s/o Rangnath Fasale Vs. the State of Maharashtra & Ors, O.A. No. 386/2019 on 8.9.2022.

4. It is the further contention of the applicant that though he was entitled to receive the 2nd benefit of ACP scheme, it has not been granted to him and he has therefore prayed for grant of 2nd benefit of ACP scheme with all consequential benefits. The learned counsel has submitted that the benefit which was given to the applicant in the year 1991 cannot be said to be 1st benefit of ACP scheme. He contended that in the year 1991 the applicant was upgraded to the post of Sectional Engineer from Jr. Engineer which cannot be held to be a promotion. The learned counsel submitted that the applicant thereafter worked for more than 12 years without

any promotion and therefore in the year 2001 the benefit of ACP scheme was granted to him and that was the first benefit under ACP scheme granted in his favour. The learned counsel submitted that in the internal correspondence in between the respondents it has been mentioned that the said benefit granted to the applicant in the year 2001 is the 1st benefit under ACP scheme. After 2001 the applicant worked for more than 12 years on the said post and as such he was entitled for 2nd benefit under ACP scheme in the year 2013. The learned counsel in the circumstances prayed for grant of 2nd benefit under ACP scheme with all consequential monetary benefits.

5. The learned Presenting Officer has opposed the request so made by the applicant. The learned PO submitted the applicant being Class-II employee cannot rest his case on the judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc.** (cited supra). The learned P.O. referring to and relying upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **High Court of**

Punjab & Hariyana & Ors. Vs. Jagdev Singh reported at 2016 AIR (SCW) 3523, submitted that in view of the fact that the applicant has given an undertaking that if any payment is made to him in excess by mistake, he shall be liable to repay the excess payment so made, applicant is estopped from raising any objection to the recovery of the said amount paid to him in excess. The learned PO submitted that even on merit also no such claim can be considered. The learned PO submitted that any payment made in excess than the entitlement of the employee is always recoverable. The learned PO submitted that the employee cannot claim the benefit for which he is not entitled.

6. The learned PO further submitted that the applicant had consented the recovery of the said excess amount paid to him by giving written consent in that regard. He invited my attention to the said consent, which is at page 106 of paper book of O.A. The learned PO submitted that once the applicant has given an unconditional consent for recovery of the said amount from the amount of leave encashment payable to him, the applicant is

estopped from objecting to the said recovery. The learned PO further submitted that the applicant has not disputed that the benefit, which was given to him in the year 2001 by way of 1st ACP scheme was given when the applicant had not completed 12 years period of service and 12 years' period of service was to be completed on 1.4.2003. The learned PO submitted that in such circumstances no error can be found on the part of the respondents if the excess amount has been recovered which was wrongly paid to the applicant. The learned PO in the circumstances has prayed for rejecting the said request of the applicant.

7. Insofar as second prayer which has been made by the applicant as about 2nd benefit under ACP scheme, it has been contended by the learned PO that the applicant entered into the Government service in the year 1981 and was promoted to the post of Sectional Engineer in the year 1991. It happened within 10 years of his entry into the service and his pay was upgraded. According to the respondents, that was the 1st ACP given to the applicant and the benefit which was given to the

applicant in the year 2001 was 2nd benefit under ACP scheme. The learned PO submitted that there is no provision for grant of 3rd benefit under ACP scheme and as such according to learned PO there is no substance in the contentions made and prayer made by the applicant for grant of 2nd benefit under ACP scheme in his favour after completing 12 years of his service after grant of 1st ACP benefit.

- 8. I have considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the applicant, as well as, on behalf of the respondents. The following facts are not in dispute:-
- (i) that the applicant entered into the Government service as Jr. Engineer in the year 1981.
- (ii) that the applicant was upgraded to the post of Sectional Engineer in the year 1991.
- (iii) that the benefit of ACP scheme was granted to the applicant in the year 2001.

- (iv) that the applicant retired from Government service while working on the post of Sectional Engineer on 31.5.2018.
- (v) that the recovery amount of Rs. 3,87,000/-was ordered after retirement of the applicant and was also recovered after his retirement from the amount of leave encashment payable to the applicant.
- (vi) that the applicant on 25.9.2018 has issued a letter to respondent no. 4 thereby giving his consent for recovery of the alleged excess wages paid to him from the amount of leave encashment payable to him.
- 9. The aforesaid facts will have to be examined in light of legal provisions which are referred to and the judgments relied upon by the parties.
- 10. It is the contention of the applicant that the respondents could not have recovered the aforesaid amount after his retirement more particularly when the alleged excess payment was made on the alleged wrong fixation or on the alleged earlier grant of

benefit of ACP scheme in the year 2001 instead of year 2003. In support of his said contention the learned counsel has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc. (cited supra). As against it the learned PO has submitted that judgment in the case of State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc. (cited supra) cannot be taken aid by the applicant since the applicant falls in the category of Class-II officer and further that amount was recovered with his consent by the respondents. The 3rd point as has been raised by the learned PO is that since instead of 2003 ACP benefit was granted to the applicant in the year 2001, the applicant has received excess wages till date of his retirement and his pension has also been fixed on the said amount. In the circumstances, the learned PO argued that the objections as are raised by the applicant cannot be sustained.

11. Whether the directions issued and the restrictions imposed on recovery of the alleged excess payment made to the employees after their

and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc.) (cited supra) would apply only to the employees falling in Class-III & Class-IV or would also apply to Class-I & Class-II employees is the another issue raised in the present matter. The Principal Bench of this Tribunal at Mumbai in the case of Shri Shakil Isaque Shaikh Vs. the Director General of Police, Mumbai & Another, in O.A. No. 401/2019 (cited supra) has answered the said controversy. I deem it appropriate to reproduce the observations made and conclusion recorded by the Tribunal in para 10 of the said order, which read thus:-

"10. True, the Applicant retired as a Class-I officer, and therefore, applicability of Clause -1 is ruled out. The submission advanced by learned P.O. that the decision in **Rafiq Masih's** case is applicable to Group –D and C employee only is misconceived. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has culled out five situations and out of which, situation No.(i) is in respect of Group –D and C employees. In so far as Class-II, III and V are concerned, the benefit of it, is not restricted to Group –C and D employees otherwise specific reference of Group–C and D would have find place but it is not so. In present case, excess payment has been made for a period excess of five years before the order of recovery is issued

which attract clause (iii) of Para No.12 of the judgment. Apart, clause (ii) & (v) also attracted since recovery is iniquitous as well as arbitrary."

- 12. Relying on the view taken by the Tribunal in the aforesaid judgment another judgment has been delivered by this Tribunal in the case of **Gautam s/o** Rangnath Fasale Vs. the State of Maharashtra & Ors, O.A. No. 386/2019 (cited supra). In the said matter also the applicant was not falling in Class-III or Class-IV employee. However, the recovery made from him after his retirement was held impermissible and refund was accordingly directed.
- 13. In the case of <u>State of Punjab and others</u> etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc. (cited supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down certain circumstances wherein recovery is to be held impermissible which are thus:-
 - "12. It is not possible to postulate all situations of hardship, which would govern employees on the issue of recovery, where payments have mistakenly been made by the employer, in excess of their entitlement. Be that as it may, based on the decisions

referred to herein above, we may, as a ready reference, summarize the following few situations, wherein recoveries by the employers, would be impermissible in law:

- (i) Recovery from employees belonging to Class-III and Class-IV service (or Group 'C' and Group 'D' service).
- (ii) Recovery from retired employees, or employees who are due to retire within one year, of the order of recovery.
- (iii) Recovery from the employees when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.
- (iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.
- (v) In any other case, where the Court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employees, would be iniquitous or harsh or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover.""
- 14. There appears substance in the argument of the learned counsel for the applicant that except

clause (i), the other clauses are applicable to the employees in general irrespective of their class and/or category. In view of the fact that this Tribunal has taken a view in the judgment cited supra, which has been reiterated in the subsequent OA, I do not see any reason to take any contrary view than the view already taken by the Tribunal. The contention of the respondents that guidelines issued in the case of **State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc.** (cited supra) would not apply to the employees, other than Class-III and Class-IV, has to be rejected.

15. 2nd objection as has been raised by the respondents that the applicant had given consent for recovering the excess amount paid to him and as such he is estopped from raising any objection in that regard is concerned, according to me, the alleged consent given by the applicant may not disentitle the applicant to object the recovery, if it is impermissible in law. Merely because the applicant consented for recovery of said amount the recovery which was impermissible cannot be held legal and

applicant possess right to claim refund of the said amount.

- 16. The 3rd issue raised by the learned PO is that the recovery of the excess amount paid during the period preceding 5 years of retirement of an employee is permissible. It was therefore his further contention that the amount recovered/paid during the period preceding 5 years of the retirement thus cannot be refunded. The order of recovery is based on the alleged wrong pay-fixation allegedly made in the year 2011 that is more than 5 years preceding to said date and hence is impermissible. The submission so made also has to be, therefore, rejected.
- 17. Lastly submission has been made by the learned PO relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **High Court of Punjab** & Hariyana & Ors. Vs. Jagdev Singh (cited supra). It was his contention that in the said matter the Hon'ble Supreme Court has distinguished the judgment in the case of **State of Punjab and others** etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc. (cited

supra) and held that in the matters where the employee concerned has given consent that in case any excess payment is made in his favour, he will be entitled to refund the said amount when it will be noticed. The learned PO submitted that in the present matter also the applicant has given an undertaking on 27.8.2018. The said undertaking given by the applicant is at page 107 of paper book of present OA, which is reproduced below:-

"हमी पत्र

मी अधी स्वाक्षरीत लिहुन देतो की, शासन सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग, निर्णय कं. एसआरव्ही-१०९५/प्र.कं.१-९५बारा, दिनांक ८.६.१९९५ तसेच शासन निर्णय वेतन १९९९/प्र.कं.१९/सेवा.३/मंत्र्राालय, मुंबई, दिनांक २०.७.२००१ च्या योजने अंतर्गत मला वरीष्ठ पदावरील वेतन श्रेणी मंजूर झाल्या नंतर या शासन निर्णयात काही सुधारणा किंवा खुलासा प्राप्त झाल्यास त्या नुसार वेतन निश्चिती मुळे जर मला अतिप्रदान झाल्यास मी ते शासनास सुलभ समान हप्त्याने परत करण्यास तयार आहे. सबब हे हमी पत्र लिहुन देत आहे."

18. Admittedly such undertaking is obtained by the respondents after retirement of the applicant and not at the time when alleged excess payment was made to the applicant. Such an undertaking also may not be useful for the respondents.

- 19. As none of the ground as has been raised on behalf of the respondents is found to be sustainable and when according to me the case of the applicant falls the of squarely in parameters the circumstances mentioned in the case of State of Punjab and others etc. Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) etc. (cited supra) I have no hesitation in holding that the recovery of Rs. 3,87,000/- from the amount of leave encashment was impermissible and hence unsustainable. The applicant is entitled for refund of the said amount.
- 20. Now about the prayer made by the applicant seeking interest on the subject amount. It is not in dispute that subject amount was recovered from the amount of leave encashment payable to the applicant after his retirement. The aforesaid recovery has been held impermissible by me for the reasons recorded by me. In the circumstances, I hold the applicant entitled for getting refund of the said amount. However, since at the relevant time the applicant had given consent for getting said amount recovered from his leave encashment amount for whatsoever reason, the applicant cannot

seek interest on the said amount. I am therefore not inclined to grant the interest on the said amount as has been claimed by the applicant.

- 21. Insofar as the claim of the applicant of grant of 2nd benefit under ACP scheme is concerned, from the documents, it cannot be inferred that the benefit extended to the applicant in the year 1991, whether was 1st or 2nd benefit under ACP scheme. The applicant has claimed the benefit of 2nd of ACP scheme after his retirement. The applicant has not provided any reason how said benefit fell due in the year 2013 and why he did not raise the said claim while in service. In the circumstances, I deem it appropriate to direct the applicant to prefer a substantive representation in that regard claiming the said benefit, which the respondents may consider on its own merits.
- 22. The applicant has also come out with a case that though the provisional pension is being paid to him his regular pension has not been determined and the same is not paid to him. He has also

prayed for payment of gratuity and commutation amounts.

23. For the reasons discussed above the following order is passed:-

ORDER

- (i) The respondents shall refund the amount of Rs. 3,87,000/- recovered from the applicant within 12 weeks from the date of this order.
- (ii) The request of the applicant for grant of interest on the aforesaid amount is rejected.
- (iii) The respondents are further directed to release all retiral benefits to the applicant within 12 weeks from the date of this order, if are not already paid and if otherwise there is no impediment for making such payment.
- (iv) The applicant shall make substantive representation for his prayer in respect of 2nd benefit of ACP scheme within 4 weeks from the date of this order with the respondents and if it

::-19-::

O.A. NO. 602/2021

is so made, the respondents shall take a decision thereon within 6 weeks thereafter on its own merit in accordance with law.

(v) The Original Application stands allowed in above terms. No order as to costs.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ARJ O.A. NO. 602 OF 2021

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 432/2022 (Ramesh Aghunathrao Kagne Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.V. Thombre, learned Counsel holding for Shri S.S. Thombre, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

2. Applicant was suspended vide order passed on 23-02-2021. Chargesheet in the departmental enquiry was not served upon the applicant within 90 days of the said order. It came to be served upon the applicant on 18-02-2022. In the present O.A. it is the contention of the applicant that since the respondents did not take review of the order of suspension after 90 days when no chargesheet was issued or served upon the applicant, the suspension order is liable to be revoked. Learned Counsel has placed his reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Ajay Kumar Chaudhary V/s. Union of India & Ors. [(2015) 7 SCC 291]. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that, till today the applicant has not been served with any

order extending period of his suspension. Learned Counsel in the circumstances has prayed for revocation of the suspension with all consequential benefits.

3. Request so made by the applicant has been opposed by respondent nos.1 to 3 by filing their affidavit in reply. In paragraph 8 of the affidavit in reply following averments are made by the respondents:

"08. As regards to the contents of Para No.V.3 of the Original Application, I say and submit that the contentions raised by the applicant are denied by the present deponent. I humbly say and submit that, as the applicant has been suspended with a view to take disciplinary action, it is not just and proper to revoke his suspension without taking a review of his suspension.

I further humbly say and submit that, the meeting in respect of the applicant's suspension was held on 29-12-2021. The applicant while working at Parbhani and Latur has committed very serious offences, accordingly the permission has been given to the Home Department for making open enquiry. In view of this the Suspension Review Committee has taken a decision to continue the applicant's

suspension. The competent authority has given approval to the said decision. Furthermore, it is not necessary to issue a separate show cause notice before issuing the suspension order. However, a show-cause notice in respect of initiating disciplinary action according to M.C.S. Rules (Discipline and Appeal), 1979 was given to the applicant. The copy of the aforesaid dated 6.10.2020 issued notice by Respondent No.3 is annexed herewith and marked as ANNEXURE R-1 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Tribunal."

(reproduced ad-verbatim from page 62-63 of O.A.)

4. From the contents as aforesaid though it seems the contentions of the respondents, the review committee has taken a decision to review the applicant's suspension no such order extending the period of suspension of the applicant seems to have been passed. The respondents also have not claimed that such order was passed by them. It further cannot be ignored that the meeting of the review committee was held much after the expiry of three months period from the date of the order of suspension passed against the applicant. The respondents have not provided any explanation why the review of the order of suspension passed against the applicant was not held immediately after expiry

of the period of three months when admittedly no charge-sheet was served upon the applicant by that time.

5. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Ajay Kumar Chaudhary V/s. Union of India & Ors. [(2015) 7 SCC 291 has ruled that the currency of suspension order should not be extended beyond three months if within this period the memorandum of charges / charge-sheet is not served on the delinquent; if the memorandum of charge / chargesheet is served, a reasoned order must be passed for the extension of the suspension. It is thus evident that as per the directions given by the Hon'ble Apex Court as above the period of suspension cannot be extended beyond the period of three months if within the said period the memorandum of charge or charge-sheet is not served upon the delinquent. As further provided if the memorandum of charge sheet is served within the period of three months even then if the period of suspension of the delinquent is to be extended, the disciplinary authority is under an obligation to pass a reasoned order for extending the period of suspension.

6. In the instant matter undisputedly memorandum of charge-sheet was not served upon the applicant within a period of three months. It is further not in dispute that despite the fact as aforesaid the order of suspension was not reviewed after expiry of the period of three months. Even if it is accepted that the meeting of the review committee was held on 29.12.2021 and the decision was taken for continuation of suspension period of the applicant, no such order has been passed by the respondents. Mere taking a decision to extend the period of suspension was not enough. disciplinary authority was under an obligation to pass a reasoned order in support of the decision to extend the period of suspension. In fact, as per the guidelines laid down in the case of Ajay Kumar **Chaudhary** (cited supra) failure of the on disciplinary authority to serve upon the applicant memorandum of charge within the period of three months, the period of suspension of the applicant could not have been extended by the respondents. It is further undisputed that the charge sheet came to be served upon the applicant on 18.02.2022 meaning thereby that when according to the

contention of the respondents meeting of the 'Suspension Review Committee' was held on 29.12.2021, no charge sheet was served upon the applicant. It is thus evident that the applicant has been subjected to the suspension beyond the period of 90 days without there being a conscious decision of the department to continue the suspension. The suspension of the delinquent beyond 90 days is wholly impermissible in law. In the instant matter the applicant is under suspension for the period more than 22 months. The suspension of the applicant is thus liable to be revoked with immediate effect. Hence, the order:-

ORDER

- A) Suspension of the applicant stands revoked with immediate effect.
- B) Respondents are directed to reinstate the applicant on the post from which he was suspended within a 10 days from the date of this order.
- C) The applicant is also held entitled to full pay and allowances after expiration of 90 days from the date of his suspension and it be paid to him within a month from the date of this order.

=7= O.A.NO.432/2022

- D) Respondents shall complete the Departmental Enquiry within 3 months from the date of this order.
- E) No order as to costs.

VICE CHAIRMAN

KPB ORAL ORDER 18.11.2022

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.163/2022 (Dr. Suhas S. Noawane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S.Deshmukh, learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri R.S.Pawar, learned Counsel for respondent no.4.

2. While working on the post of Medical Officer Group-A at the Primary Health Centre, Chimthana, Tq. Sindkheda, Dist. Dhule vide order passed on 09-09-2021 by respondent no.4 i.e. Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Dhule (hereinafter referred to as the impugned order), applicant was relieved from the duties. The impugned order is challenged by the applicant on the ground that respondent no.4 is not having any right or authority to issue such order. Learned Counsel has brought to my notice Circular 09-09-2007 dated issued by the Divisional Commissioner, Nashik wherein he has cautioned the officers working under him not to relieve the employees working under them except by following

the procedure laid down. Circular issued by the Health Department on 13-01-2011 is also relied upon by the learned Counsel wherein it is more explicitly stated that even though there may be certain allegations against any Medical Officer, the authorities under whom such officer is working shall not unilaterally relieve the said Medical Officer, and if at all, any action is to be taken against such Medical Officer, proposal has to be forwarded to the Government and unless order is passed by the Government in the matter, no further action is to be taken.

3. Learned Counsel asserted that no provision of any Act, Rule or Regulation permits respondent no.4 to pass orders alike the impugned order. Learned Counsel in the circumstances has prayed for setting aside the said order. It has been further contended that after being relieved on the basis of the impugned order, since applicant has not been given any other posting; he has not been paid the salary for the entire said period, which has now exceeded the period of one year. The applicant has, therefore, prayed for setting aside the impugned order and has

sought direction to allow the applicant to discharge his duties on the said post. Prayer has also been made for release of the unpaid salary of the said period.

4. In the instant matter, the State authorities have not filed affidavit in reply. The reply is filed by respondent no.4 i.e. Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Shri Pawar, learned Counsel Parishad, Dhule. appearing for the said respondent, in his argument reiterated the grounds taken in the affidavit in reply of the said respondent. Learned Counsel submitted valid grounds were in existence for initiating such action against the applicant and also for passing the impugned order. Learned Counsel submitted that the relevant was the period of Corona Pandemic wherein the presence of the Medical Staff and more particularly the Medical Officers was direly needed at their working place. The learned Counsel further submitted that the applicant had continuously remained absent in the said period from his duties and several complaints were, therefore, received in that regard. In the circumstances, learned Counsel submitted that respondent no.4 was constrained to

pass such order and to relieve the applicant accordingly. Learned Counsel submitted that the entire proposal has been thereafter forwarded by respondent no.4 to the Government for further necessary action. As such, according to the learned Counsel, the impugned order cannot be held erroneous.

5. I have considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the applicant as well as respondent Learned P.O. has adopted arguments no.4. advanced by the learned Counsel appearing for respondent no.4. I have also perused the documents placed on record. Only issue which falls for my consideration in the present matter is 'whether respondent no.4 was having any right or authority to pass the impugned order?' As has been submitted by Shri Deshmukh, learned Counsel appearing for the applicant, respondent no.4 does not possess any such right or authority to pass the impugned order. Learned Counsel has also submitted that if respondent no.4 was intending to get the applicant transferred at any other place or was intending to initiate any action against him,

respondent no.4 was to refer the matter to the State Government with his recommendation for taking necessary action against the applicant but in no case respondent no.4 at his own was competent to pass such order.

6. Learned Counsel has brought to my notice the Circular dated 09-09-2007 issued by the Divisional Commissioner, Nashik Region, Nashik. In the said Circular, it has been specifically stated that the Chief Executive Officers shall not initiate any action in so far as Class-II officers are concerned working under them, for their unsatisfactory work or dereliction in duty etc. without the express orders in that regard from the Government. They can forward such proposal to the Government and only after obtaining the orders from the Government they shall take action against the said officer. Counsel has also brought to my notice another Circular issued by the Director of Health Services, Mumbai wherein also it has been provided that any action to be taken against the Medical Officers working in the Health Department, the office head shall obtain the necessary orders from the

Government and without such orders, shall not take any action directly.

- 7. Learned Counsel for respondent no.4 though has submitted that respondent no.4 was competent to pass the impugned order, has not brought to my notice any such provision either in the Act or Rules or Regulations which empowers the respondent no.4 to take such action against officers like the present applicant. In so far as the Government Circulars which are relied upon by the learned Counsel for the applicant are concerned, nothing was submitted on behalf of respondent no.4 so as to hold that the instructions therein may not be applicable in the present case. In the circumstances, it has to be held that respondent no.4 was not having any right or authority to pass the impugned order.
- 8. Though it has been further contended by the learned Counsel appearing for the respondent no.4 that immediately after passing the impugned order, necessary proposal was forwarded to the Government for further necessary action against the applicant, nothing has been placed on record by

respondent no.4 to show that the Government has taken any further action as proposed by him. It is the matter of record that more than one year has lapsed after passing the impugned order. It is the further matter of record that since no further posting has been given to the applicant nor he has been allowed to join his existing post and discharge his duties, despite such interim direction from this Tribunal, the applicant is without any work and has also not been paid salary of the entire said period.

- 9. For the reasons discussed hereinabove, I hold the impugned order to have been passed by respondent no.4 without any authority and hence unsustainable. It, therefore, deserves to be set aside.
- 10. Similarly, when without any fault on his part the applicant has been kept away from his duties, I hold the applicant entitled for receiving salary of the intervening period with all admissible emoluments. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- (i) Impugned order dated 09-09-2021 issued by respondent no.4 is quashed and set aside.
- (ii) Respondents are directed to reinstate the applicant on the post from which he was relieved, within one week from the date of this order, and pay him the salary and admissible allowances of the intervening period within 4 weeks from the date of this order.
- (iii) O.A. stands allowed in the aforesaid terms without any order as to costs.

VICE CHAIRMAN

YUK ORAL ORDER 18.11.2022

M.A.NO.80/2022 IN O.A.ST.NO.1811/2021 (Vilas K Shinde Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri P.R.Tandale, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

2. For the reasons stated in the M.A. which according to me are just and sufficient, delay caused for filing the O.A. is condoned.

3. M.A.No.80/22 stands disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.

4. After removal of office objections, if any, O.A. be registered and numbered in accordance with rules.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION ST.NO.1811/2021 (Vilas K Shinde Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri P.R.Tandale, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

- 2. After registration of O.A., issue notice to the respondents, returnable on 12-01-2023.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 12-01-2023.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

M.A.NO.365/2022 IN O.A.NO.746/2022 (Babarao D. Tathe & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Kakasaheb B. Jadhav, learned Counsel for the applicants and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

2. For the reasons stated in the M.A. which according to me are just and sufficient, delay caused for filing the O.A. is condoned.

3. M.A.No.365/22 stands disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.

4. After removal of office objections, if any, O.A. be registered and numbered in accordance with rules.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A.NO.365/2022 IN O.A.NO.746/2022 (Babarao D. Tathe & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Kakasaheb B. Jadhav, learned Counsel for the applicants and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities.

- 2. After registration of O.A., issue notice to the respondents, returnable on 12-01-2023.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 12-01-2023.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.921/2018 (Shriram B. Jadhav Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.G.Salgare, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. At the request of learned P.O., S.O. to 15-12-2022 for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of the respondents.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.922/2018 (Hanshraj Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.G.Salgare, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. At the request of learned P.O., S.O. to 15-12-2022 for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of the respondents.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.923/2018 (Shivaij Shelke Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.G.Salgare, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Smt. Anuradha Mantri, learned Counsel for respondent no.4, are present.

2. At the request of learned P.O., S.O. to 15-12-2022 for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of the respondents.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.924/2018 (Dhananjay Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.G.Salgare, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. At the request of learned P.O., S.O. to 15-12-2022 for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of the respondents.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.892/2022, 893/2022 & 895/2022

(Balaji Potdar & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Ajay Deshpande, learned Counsel for the applicants and Shri M.S.Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. On request of both parties, O.A.No.869/2022

&~O.A.No.894/2022 are tagged together with these

matters.

3. All these matters be placed for hearing on

02-12-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.101/2019 (Ashok R. Chavan Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Ajay Deshpande, learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri S.R.Dheple, learned Counsel for respondent no.4, are present.

2. S.O. to 02-12-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A.NO.288/2021 IN O.A.NO.491/2019 (Satish More Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri J.M.Murkute, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. This is an application for restoration of O.A.No.491/2019 which was dismissed by this Tribunal vide order passed on 22-11-2019. Perusal of the impugned order shows that on the earlier date by order dated 09-09-2019 amendment was allowed by the Tribunal but the same was not carried out till 22-11-2019. On the said date none was present on behalf of the applicant. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that in the meanwhile period the courts were not functional because of the Corona Pandemic, and as such, some delay has occurred in filing the restoration application.
- 3. It appears to me that the matter has to be ultimately decided on merits. Moreover, just and sufficient reasons are given for restoration of the

=2= M.A.NO.288/2021 IN O.A.NO.491/2019

matter. I am, therefore, inclined to allow the present M.A. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- [i] M.A.No.288/2021 is allowed and disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.
- [ii] Delay caused in filing the restoration application is condoned.
- [iii] O.A. is restored to file on its original stage.
- [iv] Applicant shall carry out the amendment within one week from the date of this order. After amendment is carried out, list the matter on board.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.238/2021, 239/2021, 240/2021, 241/2021, 242/2021, 243/2021, 244/2021, 245/2021 & 254/2021 (Pandurang Bhalerao & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.S.Kadam, learned Counsel for the applicants in all these matter, S/Smt. M.S.Patni, Deepali Deshpande, Sanjivani Ghate, S/Shri S.K.Shirse, M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officers for the respondent authorities in respective cases, Shri S.B.Mene, learned Counsel for himself and holding for Shri G.N.Patil, learned Counsel for respondent nos.2 & 3 in O.A.Nos.238/21, 239/21, 240/21 and Shri N.U.Yadav, learned Counsel for respondent nos.2 & 3 in O.A.Nos.243/21, 244/21 & 245/21, are present.

Shri A.D.Gadekar, learned Counsel for respondent no.2 in O.A.241/21 has filed **leave note** on record.

- 2. Shri A.D.Gadekar, learned Counsel for respondent no.2 in O.A.241/21 has filed leave note on record. Shri S.B.Mene, another learned Counsel appearing for the said respondents in respective matters has also sought time. Time is granted.
- 3. S.O. to 08-12-2022.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.891/2022 (Bhausaheb Sanap Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Mayur Subhedar, learned Counsel holding for Shri C.V.Dharurkar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.K.Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the O.A. was filed with the prayer of reinstatement and during the pendency of the O.A., the applicant has been reinstated in service. Learned Counsel has, therefore, on instructions, sought leave to withdraw the present O.A. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

O.A. stands disposed of since withdrawn without any order as to costs.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1001/2022 (Dr. Kanchan N. Wanere Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B.Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri A.S.Deshmukh, learned Counsel for respondent no.4, are present.

- 2. Learned P.O. has tendered a short affidavit on behalf of respondent nos.1 to 3. Learned Counsel for respondent no.4 has also filed an affidavit on behalf of respondent no.4. Same are taken on record. Copies thereof are served on the other side. Learned Counsel for respondent no.4 has insisted for taking the matter for hearing on today itself. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that he has to file rejoinder affidavit.
- 3. Having regard to the facts and circumstances involved in the case, though I am granting time to file rejoinder, I am not inclined to give longer date.
- 4. Hence, S.O. to 22-11-2022. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.835/2021 (Vadilal P. Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.V.Thombre, learned Counsel holding for Shri S.B.Solanke, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and shri S.B.Mene, learned Counsel for respondent nos.3 & 4, are present.

2. In this matter despite availing adequate opportunities respondents have not filed affidavits in reply. However, in the interest of justice, last chance is granted to file affidavits in reply. If replies are not filed on or before the next date, matte will be heard without replies of the respondents.

3. S.O. to 21-12-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION ST. NO.1834/2022 (Sunil Saindane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Smt. Vaishali B. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Issue notice to the respondents, returnable on 11-01-2023.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 11-01-2023.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.970/2022 (Raju Korde Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri N.P.Bangar, learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri S.K.Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri S.B.Mene, learned Counsel for respondent nos.3 to 6, are present.

- 2. Issue notice to the respondents, returnable on 10-01-2023.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 10-01-2023.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.27/2022 (Shaikh Hamed Shaikh Hyder Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri R.R.Bangar, learned Counsel holding for Shri I.D.Maniyar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 12-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.27/2019 (Raosaheb Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.N.Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri I.S.Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. On request of learned Counsel for the applicant, S.O. to 21-11-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.11/2021 (Ravikant Hadoltikar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Ashish B. Rajkar, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri S.B.Mene, learned Counsel holding for Shri G.N.Patil, learned Counsel for respondent nos.3 & 4, are present.

2. S.O. to 04-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.444/2021 (Shivkumar A. Pohal Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.S.Chaudhari, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R.Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. On request of learned Counsel for the applicant, S.O. to 05-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.777/2021 (Mohd. Usman Khan Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri G.J.Dahad, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. On request of learned Counsel for the applicant, S.O. to 09-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.55/2022 (Yogesh Shirsat Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that inadvertently amendment could not be carried out though it was permitted by the Tribunal. Hence, permission is sought to carry out the amendment. Permission is granted. Amendment be carried out forthwith.

3. S.O. to 06-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.220/2022 (Prakash Kolthule Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.R.Kulkarni, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R.Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 12-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.275/2022 (Sandip Chavan Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.S.Khedkar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. At the request of learned Counsel for the applicant, S.O. to 12-01-2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.539/2022 (Bhimraj Sonkamble Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.M.Parghane, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 16-12-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.715/2022 (Navnath A. Patwadkar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.R.Deshmukh, learned Counsel holding for Shri S.B.Bhosale, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P.Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 23-11-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.843/2022 (Krishna E. Ghuge Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.S.Deshmukh, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. M.S.Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, Shri S.B.Mene, learned Counsel for respondent nos.2 & 3 and Shri S.D.Joshi, learned Counsel for respondent no.4., are present.

2. Today when the matter was taken up for consideration, learned P.O. submitted that concerned record is received to the office of CPO. Office of CPO shall provide copy of the same to the Counsel appearing for other side.

3. List the matter for hearing on 21-11-2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.07/2022 (Shaikh Anwar Abdul Kadar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Kaksaheb B. Jadhav, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 22-11-2022. **High on Board.**

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.41/2022 (Nagesh Harne & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18-11-2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Kaksaheb B. Jadhav, learned Counsel for the applicants and Smt. Deepali Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 22-11-2022. **High on Board.**

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.337 OF 2019 (Namdev D. Londhe Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri O.Y. Kashid, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. At the request of the learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 29.11.2022 for re-hearing. **High** on board.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.223 OF 2020 (Divya S. Nandi & ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.S. Jadhavar, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.112022 for re-hearing. **High On Board**.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A.ST.NO.664/2022 IN O.A.ST.NO.665 OF 2022 (Reshma K. Kamble & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.S. Jadhavar, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 05.12.2022 for re-hearing. **High On Board**.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A.NO.489/2022 IN M.A.NO.490/2022 IN O.A.NO.951 OF 2022 (Chetan A. Gangane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Y.V. Kakade, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicant tendered copy of online application form filled up by the applicant. It is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. S.O. to 23.11.2022. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then. **High On Board**.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.300 OF 2015 (Santosh P. Namdas Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Avinash S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 06.12.2022 for final hearing. **High On Board**.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.718 OF 2017 (Mohamad Arifoddin Gulam Dastagir Farooqui Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Ms. Poonam V. Bodke Patil, learned Advocate for the applicant (**absent**). Heard Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of absence of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 06.12.2022. **High On Board**.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.486 OF 2017 (Vijeta M. Ade Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.D. Godhamgaonkar, learned Advocate for the applicant (**absent**). Heard Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of absence of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.786 OF 2017 (Kailash A. Pardeshi Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Ajay S. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.256 OF 2018 (Avinash P. Chandra & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.G. Chapalgaonkar, learned Advocate for the applicants (**absent**). Heard Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of absence of learned Advocate for the applicants, S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.151 OF 2019 (Sachin A. Gade & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 09.01.2023 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.917 OF 2019 (Ashok D. Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri R.R. Bangar, learned Advocate holding for Shri I.B. Maniyar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.944 OF 2019 (Dr. Anita A. Kadam Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Shamsundar B. Patil, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.956 OF 2019 (Rajendra M. Chaudhari Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Mayur Subhedar, learned Advocate holding for Shri C.V. Dharurkar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

O.A.NOS.47, 48, 49 & 59 ALL OF 2020 (Damodhar B. Jadhav & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicants in all these O.As., Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities in all these O.As and Shri G.N. Patil, learned Advocate for the respondent No.4 in O.A.No.49/2020 and for respondent Nos.3 & 4 in O.A.No.59/2020.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.136 OF 2020 (Rameshwar G. Kadam Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri P.D. Suryawanshi, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.685 OF 2021 (Amol V. Chate & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.D. Munde, learned Advocate for the applicants (**absent**). Heard Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of absence of learned Advocate for the applicants, S.O. to 22.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION ST.NO.376 OF 2022 (Abhilash V. Gore Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri O.Y. Kashid, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Affidavit in reply filed on behalf of the respondent No.3 is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. Learned P.O. seeks time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of the respondent Nos.1,2 & 4.
- 4. In the interest of justice, further time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos.1,2 & 4.
- 5. S.O. to 16.12.2022. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.638 OF 2022 (Jitendra N. Mutkule Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.G. Pingle, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Record shows that on the last date i.e. on 13.10.2022 it was ordered that if no reply is filed on or before the next date, the respondents may not be permitted to file affidavit in reply and the matter will be heard without reply. However, today also affidavit in reply is not filed on behalf of the respondents.
- 3. Hence, list the matter for hearing without affidavit in reply of the respondents on 06.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.655 OF 2022 (Madhav C. Padvi Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri F.R. Tandale, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned C.P.O. seeks time for filing affidavit in reply.
- 3. The respondents to file affidavit in reply by the next date as a last chance and to serve copy in advance to other side.
- 4. S.O. to 12.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A.NO.67 OF 2021 IN O.A.ST.NO.268 OF 2021 (Chikkahayakanahalli D. Krishnaiah Setty Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant, Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri S.B. Mene, learned Advocate for the respondent No.4.

2. S.O. to 13.12.2022 for further consideration.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.189 OF 2018 (Dhiraj A. Salve Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Rahul O. Awsarmal, learned Advocate for the applicant, Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorizes and Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the respondent Nos.4 to 8.

2. S.O. to 12.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.591 OF 2018 (Purushottam N. Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri J.B. Choudhary, learned Advocate for the applicant has filed a **leave note**. Heard Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of leave note of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 09.01.2023 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.666 OF 2018 (Laxmi S. Gadge Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.G. Pigle, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.690 OF 2018 (Pramod A. Kulkarni Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.718 OF 2018 (Balasaheb N. Kadam Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Ajay S. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Second set is not filed.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.776 OF 2018 (Nana B. Salunke Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.D. Sugdare, learned Advocate for the applicant, Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Smt. Sunita D. Shelke, learned Advocate for the respondent No.3.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.792 OF 2018 (Keshav R. Bankar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri J.M. Wagh Patil, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.896 OF 2018 (Madhukar D. Madarase & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri R.P. Bhumkar, learned Advocate for the applicants and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.102 OF 2019 (Vishvas S. Thore Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri R.P. Bhumkar, learned Advocate for the applicant, Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri S.D. Dhongde, learned Advocate for the respondent Nos.2 & 3.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.647 OF 2019 (Balasaheb T. Deshmukh Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.787 OF 2019 (Laxman P. Huse Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

T.A.NO.13/2022 IN W.P.NO.8626/2022 (Sudam S. Mahajan Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

non bie biin bijay naman, member

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Ms. Vaishali Suryawanshi Birajdar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent Nos.1 to 5.

- 2. Shri Avinash S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate filed **VAKALATNAMA** on behalf of the respondent No.6. It is taken on record.
- 3. Learned Advocate for the applicant submitted that she has already filed service affidavit.
- 4. At the request made on behalf of the respondents, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply.
- 5. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A.NO. 210/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 439/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 212/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 441/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 213/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 432/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 214/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 451/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 215/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 443/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 216/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 435/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 217/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 437/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 227/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 455/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 228/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 453/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 240/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 957/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 241/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 955/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 242/2015 IN O.A.ST. NO. 960/2015 WITH M.A.NO. 202/2014 IN M.A.ST. NO. 447/2014 IN O.A.ST.NO. 449/2014 (Syed Sarfaraz Ahmed & Ors. Vs. State of Maha. & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita A. Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicants in all these cases, Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondent No. 1 in all these cases, Shri G.N. Patil, learned Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in M.A. Nos. 210, 213, 215, 217, 227, 228 all of 2015 & 202/2014 and S.B. Patil, learned Advocate for the respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in M.A.Nos.240/15, 241/15, 242/15.

3. S.O. to 23.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 894 OF 2019 (Suman B. Wavdhane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri G.L. Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Issue notices to the respondents, returnable on 21.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 21.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

MEMBER (A)

M.A. No. 323/2022 in O.A. St. No. 1251/2022 (Ashok B. Pawar & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri K.B. Jadhav, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. This is an applications preferred by the applicants seeking leave to sue jointly.
- 3. For the reasons stated in the applications, and since the cause and the prayers are identical and since the applicants have prayed for same relief, and to avoid the multiplicity, leave to sue jointly granted, subject to payment of court fee stamps, if not paid.
- 4. The accompanying O.A. be registered and numbered, after removal of office objections, if any. The present M.A. No. 323/2022 stands disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION ST. NO. 1251 OF 2022 (Ashok B. Pawar & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri K.B. Jadhav, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Issue notices to the respondents, returnable on 21.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicants are authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 21.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

MEMBER (A)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 1008 OF 2022 (Suresh R. More Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.M. Hajare, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 24.11.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

KPB ORAL ORDERS 18.11.2022

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 1015 OF 2022 (Vilas D. Jagtap Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

DATE

Heard Shri O.Y. Kashid, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Issue notices to the respondents, returnable on 16.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 16.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

MEMBER (A)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION ST. NO. 1718 OF 2022 (Dinkar R. Bhosarikar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.D. Gadekar, learned Advocate for the applicant (**Leave Note**). Heard Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. In view of leave note filed by the learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 16.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

KPB ORAL ORDERS 18.11.2022

MA St. 1781/22 in MA St. 1782/22 in OA St. 1783/22 (Dadabhau D. Belote & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. This is an applications preferred by the applicants seeking leave to sue jointly.
- 3. For the reasons stated in the applications, and since the cause and the prayers are identical and since the applicants have prayed for same relief, and to avoid the multiplicity, leave to sue jointly granted, subject to payment of court fee stamps, if not paid.
- 4. The M.A. St. No. 1782/2022 be registered and numbered, after removal of office objections, if any. The present M.A. St. No. 1781/2022 stands disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A. No. St. 1782/22 in O.A. St. No. 1783/22 (Dadabhau D. Belote & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Issue notices to the respondents in M.A., returnable on 22.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 22.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

MEMBER (A)

MA St. 1804/22 in MA St. 1805/22 in OA St. 1806/22 (Manik J. Bhamre & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. This is an applications preferred by the applicants seeking leave to sue jointly.
- 3. For the reasons stated in the applications, and since the cause and the prayers are identical and since the applicants have prayed for same relief, and to avoid the multiplicity, leave to sue jointly granted, subject to payment of court fee stamps, if not paid.
- 4. The M.A. St. No. 1805/2022 be registered and numbered, after removal of office objections, if any. The present M.A. St. No. 1804/2022 stands disposed of accordingly without any order as to costs.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A. No. St. 1805/22 in O.A. St. No. 1806/22 (Manik J. Bhamre & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Issue notices to the respondents in M.A., returnable on 22.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 22.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.

MEMBER (A)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 876 OF 2016 (Anuradha R. Gavane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri M.S. Bhosle, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. The present matter is closed for orders.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 607 OF 2021 (Sachin K. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Pushpak Gujrathi, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent No. 2. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent No. 1.
- 4. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for admission.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 767 OF 2021 (Baliram B. Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Smt. Suchita Dhongde, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 01.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 811 OF 2022

(The Association of the Ministerial Services of Department of Agriculture through it's Secretary & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri G.R. Jadhav, learned Advocate holding for Shri Avishkar Shelke, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Same it taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits that the applicants do not wish to file rejoinder affidavit.
- 4. S.O. to 28.11.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 739 OF 2016 (Datta Baliram Mukhade Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.P. Dhoble, learned Advocate holding for Shri A.V. Patil (Indrale), learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicant on instructions seeks permission to withdraw the present Original Application.
- 3. When the unconditional withdrawal is sought, we have no reason to refuse the permission. Hence, permission to withdraw the present Original Application is granted. Accordingly, the O.A. stands disposed of as withdrawn with no order as to costs.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 31 OF 2017 (Subhash R. Gutte Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.P. Dhobale, learned Advocate holding for Shri A.V. Patil (Indrale), learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. By consent of both the sides, S.O. to 09.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 920 OF 2016 (Sunita M. Gabale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.P. Dhoble, learned Advocate holding for Shri A.V. Patil (Indrale), learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. By consent of both the sides, S.O. to 09.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 476 OF 2016 (Ashvini P. Gange Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri S.P. Dhoble, learned Advocate holding for Shri A.V. Patil (Indrale), learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. By consent of both the sides, S.O. to 09.12.2022 for final hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

C.P. No. 05/2022 in O.A. No. 69/2020 (Suresh G. Tandale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Swaraj Tandale, learned Advocate holding for Shri B.R. Kedar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents in C.P.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 158 OF 2019 (Bhagwat M. Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri G.N. Kulkarni (Mardikar), learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits that the applicant does not wish to file rejoinder affidavit.
- 3. S.O. to 15.12.2022 for admission.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

O.A. Nos. 179, 180, 279, 280 & 346 all of 2019 (Dr. Suryakant D. Sonkhedkar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri J.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicants in all these O.As. and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents in all these O.As.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicants submits that the applicants do not wish to file rejoinder affidavit in all these O.As.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for admission.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 853 OF 2019 (Shriram C. Pachpute & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri R.N. Bharaswadkar, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted as a last chance for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent No. 1.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 176 OF 2021 (Ganesh B. Gambhire Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri B.V. Thombre, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, time is granted as a last chance for filing rejoinder affidavit.
- 3. S.O. to 10.01.2023.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 230 OF 2021 (Vaidya Meenal P. Thosar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Ajay Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Await service of notice upon the respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 500 OF 2021 (Swapnil S. Jagtap Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Mayur Subhedar, learned Advocate holding for Shri C.V. Dharurkar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3. Shri Avinash Shejwal, learned Advocate for respondent No. 4, **absent**. None present on behalf of respondent No. 5 though duly served.

- 2. Record shows that the affidavit in reply is already filed on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
- 3. As none present for the respondent No. 4, S.O. to 21.12.2022 as a last chance for filing affidavit in reply on their behalf.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 568 OF 2021 (Bhausaheb S. Pansare Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Avinash Khedkar, learned Advocate for the applicant, Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 and Shri Shamsunder B. Patil, learned Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 to 5.

- 2. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, time is granted as a last chance for filing rejoinder affidavit.
- 3. S.O. to 12.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 595 OF 2021 (Indirakant N. Bhalerao Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Ajay Deshpande, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, time is granted for filing rejoinder affidavit.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 80 OF 2022 (Nilesh S. Arke Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Mayur Subhedar, learned Advocate holding for Shri C.V. Dharurkar, learned Advocate for the applicant, Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 and Shri A.S. Kakade, learned Advocate for the respondent No. 4.

- 2. At the request made on behalf of respondents, time is granted as a last chance for filing affidavit in reply.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 162 OF 2022 (Gopal P. Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.S. Sonawane, learned Advocate for the applicant (**Absent**). Heard Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Chief Presenting Officer, time is granted as a last chance for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 23.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 244 OF 2022 (Maharashtra State Gazetted Medical Officer Association Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri M.R. Kulkarni, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted as a last chance for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 567 OF 2022 (Devrao C. Dhole Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri P.S. Anerao, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. S.O. to 23.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 716 OF 2022 (Dr. Pravinkumar C. Govande Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.D. Sugdare, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Chief Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 28.11.2022.

MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 694 OF 2022 (Pradeep D. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Shamsunder B. Patil, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 755 OF 2022 (Sopan R. Suryawanshi Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 19.12.2022. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 764 OF 2022 (Muzaffar Abdul Sayeed Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri M.R. Kulkarni, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 16.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 767 OF 2022 (Jaywant R. Wagh Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri K.B. Jadhav, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent No. 3. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2, 4 & 5.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 768 OF 2022 (Satish D. Narwade Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri O.Y. Kashid, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 16.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 828 OF 2022 (Shailendra G. Sasane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Await service of notice upon the respondents.
- 3. At the request of learned Advocate for the applicant, S.O. to 22.12.2022 for taking necessary steps.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 838 OF 2022 (Dr. Shrikant S. Shingarwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.D. Sugdare, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 839 OF 2022 (Dr. Gorakh V. Suramwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.D. Sugdare, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

KPB ORAL ORDERS 18.11.2022

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 844 OF 2022 (Padma K. Shinde Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J)

and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. S.O. to 02.01.2023 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 854 OF 2022 (Vaishali R. Andhale & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Advocate for the applicants and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits that during the course of the day service affidavit would be filed.
- 3. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 4. S.O. to 22.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 857 OF 2022 (Dr. Chandrajyoti R. Dhage Vs. State of Mah. & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri J.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. Await service of notice on the respondents.
- 4. S.O. to 23.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 863 OF 2022 (Dr. Vinod G. Jogdand Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri D.M. Hange, learned Advocate for the applicant (**Absent**). Heard Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Await service of notice upon the respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 23.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 865 OF 2022 (Sangamesh G. Lakhe & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.C. Patil (Ashtekar), learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 23.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 927 OF 2022 (Ratan V. Kajale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri Avinash Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents.
- 3. S.O. to 23.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A. No. 68/2020 in O.A. St. No. 2452/2019 (Swati P. Patil Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri A.V. Thombre, learned Advocate holding for Shri S.S. Thombre, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits that the applicant does not wish to file rejoinder affidavit in M.A.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022 for hearing.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

M.A. No. 96/2022 in O.A. St. No. 96/2022 (Panjabrao D. Bhosle & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri V.S. Kadam, learned Advocate for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents in M.A.
- 3. S.O. to 16.12.2022.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

O.A. Nos. 614, 666, 693, 737, 780, 747, 748, 769 749, 750, 751, 777, 778, 787, 788, 796, 803, 804, 790, 791 & 832 all of 2022 (Dr. Deepak N. Nawale & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard S/shri A.D. Sugdare, J.S. Deshmukh, V.S. Kadam, S.S. Tandale, learned Advocate holding for Shri B.R. Kedar, Avinash Desmukh, V.S. Valse & S.N. Pagare, learned Advocates for the respective applicants in respective O.As., Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities in all these O.As. and Shri M.B. Kolpe, learned Advocate for respondent No. 3 in 14 O.As.

- 2. Record shows that affidavit is filed on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 & 2 in O.A. Nos. 666, 693, 737 & 769 all of 2022.
- 3. At the request made on behalf of respondents, time is granted for filing affidavit in reply in remaining O.As.
- 4. Await service of notice upon the respondents in O.A. 823/2022.
- 5. S.O. to 28.11.2022. Interim relief granted earlier to continue till then.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 842 OF 2022 (Dr. Ramdas B. Panchal Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

<u>CORAM</u>: Hon'ble Shri V.D. Dongre, Member (J) and

Hon'ble Shri Bijay Kumar, Member (A)

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri J.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer filed affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 & 2. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.
- 3. S.O. to 22.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 165 OF 2020 (Babu D. Ghute Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present. Shri A.D. Gadekar, learned counsel for respondent No. 2, leave note.

- 2. Learned counsel for the applicant has sought time for filing rejoinder affidavit. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 15.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 341 OF 2021 (Prashant S. Pardhi Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.P. Chate, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Deepali S. Deshpande, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Presenting Officer has tendered across the bar affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.

3. S.O. to 19.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 114 OF 2022 (Dr. Bhausaheb S. Randhe Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri J.S. Deshmukh, learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri U.S. Mote, learned Counsel for respondent No. 3, are present.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant has sought time for filing rejoinder affidavit. Time granted.

3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 603 OF 2022 (Sachin G. Shelke Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.D. Kotkar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Presenting Officer has tendered across the bar affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent No. 2. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side.

3. S.O. to 20.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 626 OF 2022 (Darshan D. Kale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.B. Kolpe, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned counsel for the applicant has sought time for filing rejoinder affidavit. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 16.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 668 OF 2022 (Kishor C. Koli Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.G. Salgar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 15.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 671 OF 2022 (Kiran S. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.D. Dhongde, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 770 OF 2022 (Surendra M. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 797 OF 2022 (Amol S. Ajabe Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 816 OF 2022 (Rushikesh V. Gorde Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 871 OF 2022 (Santosh A. Jadhav Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri N.R. Pawade, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 201/2020 in O.A. St. No. 464/2020 (Satish S. Gungale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.B. Wagh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Notice not collected of respondent No. 3.

3. S.O. to 10.01.2023.

VICE CHAIRMAN

 ${\rm KPB\ ORAL\ ORDERS\ 18.11.2022}$

M.A. No. 12/2021 in O.A. St. No. 34/2021 (Gorakh B. Dhakane Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri D.A. Mane, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 22.12.2022 as a final chance for filing rejoinder affidavit.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 143/2022 in O.A. St. No. 75/2022 (Sudhir S. Bramhne Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.B. Kale, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. At the request of learned counsel for the applicant, S.O. to 20.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 209/2022 in O.A. St. No. 108/2021 (Ashok R. Jujgar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.R. Kulkarni, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

- 2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents in M.A. Time granted.
- 3. S.O. to 20.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 287/2022 in O.A. St. No. 408/2022 (Krishna B. Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.D. Gawale, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Presenting Officer has sought time for filing affidavit in reply on behalf of respondents in M.A. Time granted.

3. S.O. to 21.12.2022.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 318/2020 in O.A. St. No. 1373/2020 (Anil G. Lokhande Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.B. Rajkar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 04.01.2023 for hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. No. 228/2021 in O.A. St. No. 775/2021 (Jagannath T. Mundhe Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri J.M. Murkute, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 15.12.2022 for hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

M.A. 298/2022 in M.A. 503/2019 in O.A. St. 2016/19 (Amina Begum Meheboob Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Ashish Rajkar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, is present.

2. S.O. to 19.12.2022 for hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 202 OF 2017 (Ashok B. Wagh Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri G.R. Jadhav, learned counsel holding for Shri Avishkar Shelke, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 28.11.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 889 OF 2018 (Sayyed Matinoddin Aminoddin Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.R. Dheple, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 02.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

O.A. No. 139/2019 with O.A. No. 946/2018 (Madhukar R. Dusane & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.D. Sugdare, learned Counsel for the applicants in both the O.As., Shri M.S. Mahajan, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities in both the O.As. and Smt. Sunita D. Shelke, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 & 3 in O.A. No. 139/2019 & respondent No. 3 in O.A. No. 946/2018, are present.

2. S.O. to 05.01.2023 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 557 OF 2019 (Venkat V. Namule & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Shamsunder B. Patil, learned Counsel for the applicants and Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 24.11.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 550 OF 2021 (Shobha S. Bidhe & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri C.V. Dharurkar, learned Counsel for the applicants and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 09.01.2023 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 139 OF 2017 (Shaikh Liyakat Shaikh Dildar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri V.P. Golewar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 23.11.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 277 OF 2017 (Shiakh Meboob Abdul Kareem Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.S. Jadhavar, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 16.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 88 OF 2019 (Kashinath G. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Ms. Preeti Wankhade, learned Counsel for the applicant and Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 15.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 2666 OF 2019 (Mahendrasingh N. Girase Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri M.V. Salunke, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. Sanjivani K. Deshmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri G.D. Jain, learned counsel for respondent No. 2, are present.

2. S.O. to 09.01.2023 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 982 OF 2019 (Govind Y. Bharaskhale Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri K.G. Salunke, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.P. Gude, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 16.01.2023 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 333 OF 2020 (Arjun M. Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri K.B. Jadhav, learned Counsel for the applicant, Smt. M.S. Patni, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri Shamsunder B. Patil, learned counsel for respondent No. 2, are present.

2. S.O. to 15.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 514 OF 2020 (Kamlakar B. Kulkarni Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri Avinash Deshmukh, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. S.O. to 13.01.2023 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 103 OF 2021 (Dr. Harishchandra T. Kokani Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri S.D. Joshi, learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri S.K. Shirse, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities and Shri R.N. Jain, learned counsel for respondent No. 3, are present.

2. S.O. to 28.11.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 513 OF 2021 (Manik G. Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.D. Gadekar, learned Counsel for the applicant (**Leave Note**). Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, is present.

2. S.O. to 15.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 331 OF 2022 (Mandabai C. Khambat Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE : 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri A.D. Gadekar, learned Counsel for the applicant (**Leave Note**). Shri D.R. Patil, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, is present.

2. S.O. to 16.12.2022 for final hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 340 OF 2021 (Popat B. Ahire Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Shri P.B. Jadhav, learned counsel holding for Shri S.P. Chate, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri I.S. Thorat, learned Presenting Officer for the respondent authorities, are present.

2. Learned Presenting Officer has tendered across the bar affidavit in reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3. Same is taken on record and copy thereof has been served on the other side. Hence, it can be presumed that the respondent No. 3 is duly served.

3. S.O. to 19.12.2022 for filing rejoinder affidavit, if any.

VICE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 934 OF 2022 (Rahimatbi S. Babulal & Ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

CORAM: Hon'ble Justice Shri P.R. Bora,

Vice Chairman

DATE: 18.11.2022

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Shri K.G. Salunke, learned Advocate for the applicants and Smt. Sanjivani K. Desmukh-Ghate, learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

- 2. At the request of learned counsel for the applicant, issue fresh notice to the respondent No. 4, returnable on 05.12.2022.
- 3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at once and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
- 4. Applicants are authorized and directed to serve on respondent/s intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of the case. 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 acknowledgment be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry before due date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
- 7. S.O. to 05.12.2022.
- 8. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.