

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No.

of 20

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.05.2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O.A.No.51 of 2020 with O.A.No.52 of 2020 with O.A.No.488 of 2019 with O.A.No.492 of 2019 with O.A.No.493 of 2019</p> <p>K.B. Shivsharan (O.A.51/2020) D.P. Patil (O.A.52/2020) G.R. Khandagale (O.A.488/2019) D.L. Melge (O.A.492/2019) S.K. Vhanmane (O.A.493/2019) Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Amruta Chalke, learned Advocate holding for Mr. Arjun Patil, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Application is made by learned Advocate for extension of time to carry out amendment pursuant to the order dated 20.04.2022.</p> <p>3. As per request time is extended by two weeks i.e. 14.06.2022.</p> <p>4. Adjourned to 14.06.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">Sd/- / (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">prk</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.05.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.1066 of 2021</p> <p>V.D. Salok & Ors.Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Pooja Mankoji, learned Advocate holding for Mr. S.S. Dere, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. In this matter learned Advocate for the Applicants submit that yesterday i.e. on 19.05.2022 the list of promotions was declared and this list was received by the Applicants in the evening. Applicants received this order of promotions regarding the Respondents and other officers. Learned Advocate submits that by way of interim relief this order of promotion is to be made subject to outcome of the O.A. She further submits that if such order is not passed then O.A. will be infructuous.</p> <p>3. Learned P.O. objects that there is no proper M.A. for interim relief and just order of promotion is produced without any proper prayer and proper format.</p> <p>4. No proper application is made before the Tribunal. Under such circumstances such order of giving any interim relief cannot be passed. Moreover it appears that more than 1 to 13 added Respondents, this relief can be operative against more persons.</p> <p>5. Adjourned to 23.05.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____ DISTRICT
..... Applicant/s

(Advocate)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.05.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.491 of 2019</p> <p>V.V. Alange Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Amruta Chalke, learned Advocate holding for Mr. Arjun Patil, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Application is made by learned Advocate for extension of time to carry out amendment pursuant to the order dated 20.04.2022.</p> <p>3. As per request time is extended by two weeks i.e. 14.06.2022.</p> <p>4. Adjourned to 14.06.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____ DISTRICT _____ Applicant/s

(Advocate)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

<p>Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders</p>	<p>Tribunal's orders Date : 20.05.2022</p>
	<p>M.A.No.295 of 2022 in O.A.No.469 of 2022</p> <p>S.P. Pawar & Ors.Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. Abhinav Teward a/w Mr. Vedang Kulkarni i/b Mr. Sushant Lalimbe, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. This is an application for leave to sue jointly.</p> <p>3. Considering the cause of action pursued by the Applicants is common, concurrent and usual, the cases are not required to be decided separately.</p> <p>4. In this view of the matter, the present Misc. Application is allowed subject to Applicants paying requisite court fees, if not already paid.</p> <p>5. M.A. is allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

Original Application No.

of 20

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.05.2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O.A.No.469 of 2022</p> <p>S.P. Pawar & Ors.Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. Abhinav Teward a/w Mr. Vedang Kulkarni i/b Mr. Sushant Lalimbe, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Applicants who are aspiring to become Police Sub Inspector and appeared for the LDC Preliminary Examination on 16.04.2022 pursuant to advertisement dated 11.02.2022, prays that the entire recruitment process to be stayed.</p> <p>3. Learned Advocate submits that though there are 765 vacancies for the post of PSI the Government has decided to fill-up 250 posts as per the advertisement. Applicants have appeared for the said examination. They are likely to be age barred. Further the examination was not conducted earlier due to COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore it is to be stayed and the appointments are to be made with full strength i.e. 765 posts.</p> <p>4. Learned P.O. submits that urgency can be made out in view of the advertisement and the date of examination. She submits that though the Applicants were aware that the Respondent-State has declared recruitment for 250 posts only, they had not raised any grievance by approaching the Tribunal well within time.</p> <p>5. Considered submissions.</p> <p>6. In view of the points raised by the learned P.O. no urgency is made out. No interim relief can be granted.</p>

[P.T.O.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>7. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>8. Issue notice before admission returnable on 13.06.2022.</p> <p>9. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondent intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Private service is allowed. Respondents are put to notice that the case may be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.</p> <p>9. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.</p> <p>10. By Hand delivery, speed post, courier notice to be served and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.</p> <p>11. Adjourned to 13.06.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- <i>J</i> (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>