(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

M.A.362/2016 in O.A.683/2016

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

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

Issue notice returnable on 03.10.2016.

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

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

This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

The service may be done by hand delivery / speed post / courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

S.O. to 3rd October, 2016.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. A.J. chougule
~~C.P.O~~/P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 3/10/16.

[PTO.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

O.A.437/2016

Shri P.B. Pardeshi ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

Affidavit-in-rejoinder is taken on record. Admit. Liberty to mention granted.

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

Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation / notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A.

This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988. The questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

The service may be done by hand delivery / speed post / courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ Sarita Sureyawanshi
~~C.P.O.~~ P.O. for the Respondents
Rejoinder Filed by Applicant.
~~Adv. to~~ OA is Admit
Liberty to mention granted.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-P-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

DATE : 20/9/16

CORAM :

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

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

APPEARANCE :

Shri/Smt. M.D. Lonkar

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Archana B.K.

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

Reply filed by R.No.2

~~Adj. to~~ S.O. to 4/10/16

O.A.327/2016

Shri M.M. Kathe & Ors. ... Applicants

Vs.

The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Smt. A.B. Kololgi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Smt. Kololgi, the learned P.O. is being instructed by Shri S.G. Kolteke, Head Clerk, DGP Office.

The Affidavit-in-reply of Respondent No.2 is taken on record. The directions were given by the Hon'ble Chairman on 8.8.2016 and time was about six weeks. Still it seems that Mr. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant is right in contending that all steps including the preparation of the Affidavit-in-reply were taken yesterday only. These facts are noted. The option to take some action in the matter ~~may~~ lies open. The Respondents may file further Affidavit. The learned P.O. informs that during the course of the day today, the Applicants would be intimated with the outcome of the order. Further in as much as the representation apparently has been rejected, now there should be no impediment in the way of filing a comprehensive complete Affidavit-in-reply which also to be done on the next date.

S.O. to 4th October, 2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) 20.9.16

Member (J)

20.09.2016

(skw)

2

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

O.A.711/2016

Shri R.B. Sutar ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. A.B. Kololgi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Smt. Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the Applicant does not want to file Rejoinder. The OA is admitted. The submission of the learned Advocate is that the Applicant retires in November this year, and therefore, on her request, a fixed date is given as 4th October, 2016.

S.O. to 4th October, 2016.

Sd/- 20.9.16
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R.B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Punam Mahajan
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Archana B.K.
~~C.P.O.~~ P.O. for the Respondents
O.A. is Admitted.
~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 4/10/16.
FH

[P.T.O.

2

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

DATE : 20/9/16

CORAM :

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

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

APPEARANCE :

~~Shri/Smt. .....~~ Applicant and Advocate absent.

~~Advocate for the Applicant~~

~~Shri/Smt. :~~ Smita Sooryawanshi.

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

~~Adj To:~~ S.O. to 18/10/16.

Last chance Poor Reply.

(skw)

O.A.419/2016

Shri V.G. Lokkare ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Applicant and his Advocate absent. Smt. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

It seems that the Applicant has no interest in this matter. However, last chance is granted for reply.

S.O. to 18th October, 2016.

Sd/- 20.9.16

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

O.A.637/2016

Shri R.B. Bhosale ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

This OA not only can but has got to be decided here and now. The justification for this observation shall become clear as the short discussion progresses.

The relief sought and ultimately that is the OA all about is that the 2nd Respondent be directed to deal with, decide and dispose of the Applicant's representation dated 22nd January, 2014 in accordance with the law and communicate its decision within a reasonable period to the Applicant. It was on 1st August, 2016 that the Hon'ble Chairman, by an order of that date was pleased to give elaborate directions and he framed 7 points on which he wanted the response of the Respondents. All of them were pertaining to the decision of the representations. It was further mentioned in the 6th Paragraph that the Affidavit would not be necessary, if Applicant's representation was decided before the next date and the matter was adjourned to today.

The above discussion must have made it quite clear that a period of more than two years and nine months has not been found sufficient by the concerned Respondent to decide the representation and there is a certain stage at which the Tribunal must cry a halt to this kind of an attitude. Rejecting the request for time to file Affidavit-in-reply or to take instructions, quite dutifully made by the learned P.O. Smt. Gaikwad, I direct that the representation above referred be decided by the 2nd Respondent within four weeks from today and the decision be communicated to the Applicant within one week thereafter. The OA is allowed in these terms with no order as to costs.

Sd/-
20.9.16

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
Shri/~~Smt.~~ M.D. Lonkar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ K.S. Gaikwad
~~C.P.O./~~P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. to~~ O.A. is allowed.

[P.T.O.

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

M.A.202/2016 in O.A.400/2016

Shri D.T. Joshi ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

This MA seeks condonation of delay.

I have heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

It is not necessary for me to delve into the factual aspect such as it is in the OA itself. It would be suffice to mention that, although the Applicant himself has mentioned the delay to be of 11 years and 11 months, the submissions at the Bar were that there is no delay because it is an instance of continuing wrong with the result the delay would not be there *stricto-sensu*.

In Union of India Vs. Tarsem Singh, 2008(8) SCC 648, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to lay down the principles of continuing wrong and for that, a few earlier Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court were referred to. It is clearly observed that the principle of continuing wrong would be very much applicable even in service matters. Mrs. Mahajan also relied upon the order of this Tribunal in a fasciculus of MAs, the leading one being MA 456/2013 in OA 1183/2012 (Smt. H.M. Sane Vs. State of Maharashtra and other MAs, dated 27.1.2014). Therefore, it is quite clear that there is no delay because once it is found that the case of continuing wrong, the time never begins to run as the term is understood in the realm of this field of law. The learned P.O. in stoutly opposing the application invited particular reference to the huge delay as she perceives it of about 13 years. Though she did her very best to persuade me to go along with her, but it is not possible for me to do so bound as I am by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is, therefore, held that there was no delay in bringing the OA such as it was and even if there was one, it was capable of being condoned. The Applicant and the Office of this Tribunal are directed to process the matter further and get the OA listed for further consideration. The MA is allowed in these terms with no order as to costs.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R.B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE
Smt. Punam Mahajan
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ Ms. Savita Suryawanshi
~~C.P.O.~~ P.O. for the Respondents
Reply filed by R. No. 1 to 4.
~~Adv. in~~ in M.A. and O.A.
M.A. is allowed.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000--2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

M.A.359/2016 in O.A.914/2016

The Transport Undertaking
Thane Municipal Corpn. ... Applicant
Vs.
Shri Arun A. Desale & ors. ... Respondents

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

Issue notice returnable on 04.10.2016.

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

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

This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

The service may be done by hand delivery / speed post / courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

S.O. to 4th October, 2016.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik) 20.9.16
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE : 20/9/16
CORAM :
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. A.J. chougule
~~C.P.O./~~P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 4/10/16.

[P.T.O.

2

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

O.A.276 & 277/2016

Shri K.R. Dhumal & Anr. ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Smt. Lata Patne, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Smt. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

The arguments in these OA have completed. There is some problem with regard to the description of the Applicant in the Police record relevant hereto where the name of an allegedly outlaw Mr. Nadaf has been shown along with the names of both the ladies. The learned P.O. had assured me yesterday that an appropriate document will be presented to show that the necessary corrections have been made. The one communication shown pertains only to Applicant Mr. Barudwale while nothing is there in so far as the Applicant Ms. Dhumal is concerned. I direct that the proper Affidavit be filed explaining the stand of the Respondents on 22nd September, 2016.

S.O. to 22nd September, 2016.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

DATE: 20/9/16
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri~~ Smt. Lata Patne
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri~~ Smt. Ms. Savita Suryawanshi
~~C.P.O.~~/P.O. for the Respondents

~~Adj. to~~ S.O. to 23/9/16. (skw)

Part heard.
PH
(OA 277/16)

P.T.O.

6

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 District

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

DATE : 20/9/16

CORAM :

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

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

APPEARANCE :

~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.A. Gharte

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ Savita Suryawanshi

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

~~Adj. To~~ S.O. to 27/9/16

Hamdast.

O.A.312 with 313 & 406/2016

Shri R.A. Kulkarni ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri Amit Gharte, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

The learned P.O. is being instructed by Shri H.D. Randive, Section Officer, MPSC. A sealed envelope is present for my perusal. I have perused the earlier orders made by the Hon'ble Chairman. As of today, it is not necessary to open the same and it is handed back to the learned P.O. for being handed over to the said Officer named above. In view of the request of the learned P.O. that only one week's time is necessary to consider the eligibility of the 51 candidates for the post of Assistant Motor Vehicle Inspector. It is made quite clear that the manner in which the matter has progressed and the Hon'ble Chairman had to made orders repeatedly, no further extension of time shall be given. A copy hereof be furnished to both the sides during the course of the day.

S.O. to 27th September, 2016. Hamdast.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

IPTO

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

DATE: 20/9/16

CORAM:

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

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

APPEARANCE:

~~Shri~~ Shri R.K. Mendadkar

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri~~ Smt. S. Sceeta Sceeyaawanshi

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

~~Adj To~~ O.A. is Allowed.

Hamdast.

O.A.883/2016

Shri S.B. Shirsath ... Applicant

Vs.

The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri R.K. Mendadkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

This OA which is comparatively recently instituted not only can be but has got to be decided post haste just now. The truism of this observation will manifests itself as the discussion progresses.

I have perused the record and proceedings and more particularly the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.25218/2015, dated 7.9.2015 which order read as follows :

> "Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this special leave petition and make a representation to the Government seeking protection of service already rendered. In view thereof, this special leave petition is dismissed as withdrawn."

Pursuant thereto, the Applicant made representations to the Respondents 1 & 2 on 14.12.2015 and 5.11.2015 and it appears that, time of 9 months and 10 months respectively was still not found sufficient by the concerned Respondent, more particularly when there was an order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court pursuant whereto the representations were made. The learned P.O. is being instructed by Shri R.B. Phulpagar, Superintendent, Directorate of Civil Defense, Mumbai and she wanted some time to file Affidavit-in-reply, etc. From the above discussion, it must have become clear that there was no question of protracting this matter any further. The Respondents may or may not have some regard and respect for the highest Court of the land, but this Tribunal can certainly not accompany them in their conduct and attitude. Brushing aside all such requests, I direct that the representation above referred to be decided within four weeks from today and the outcome be informed to the Applicant within one week thereafter and though this OA shall not remain pending technically, the said Respondents shall also submit compliance report to this Tribunal and the Registrar of this Tribunal shall bring it to my notice that the order has been complied with. The OA is allowed in these terms with no order as to costs. Hamdast.

20.9.16

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

2

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

O.A.325/2016

Shri G.P. Rekulwad ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

Shri Bhise, the learned P.O. is being instructed by Smt. Vidya Bhoite, Assistant Section Officer, Home Department.

I have perused the earlier orders made by the Hon'ble Chairman. Shri Bhise informs that after 1st September, 2016, two more stages have been completed and the matter now rests with the Hon'ble Chief Minister, who also holds the port-folio of Home to take a final decision. As of today, the OA stands adjourned to 4th October, 2016 and it is hoped that, this time will be sufficient for the completion of all the formalities in the matter.

S.O. to 4th October, 2016. Hamdast. Steno-copy allowed.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE : 20/9/16
CORAM :
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice - Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE :
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ K.B. Bhise
~~C.P.O./~~ P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adv. To~~ S.O. to 4/10/16.
Hamdast.

[PTO

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

O.A.922/2016

Shri R.B. Mali ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

The matter comes up before me for consideration of interim relief. The Applicant is a Police Constable (Electrician). According to him, he has been transferred on deputation to SRPF, Dhule, Group-VI and this has been done without obtaining his consent for which proposition, Rule 36 of Maharashtra Civil Services (Joining Time, Foreign Service and Payments during Suspension, Dismissal and Removal) Rules, 1981. In that connection, reliance has placed on interim order of the Aurangabad Bench of this Tribunal in **OA 694/2016 (S.K. Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors., dated 26.8.2016)**. Although the learned P.O. stoutly opposes the grant of any interim relief, in view of the above discussion, I am of the opinion that the Applicant cannot be left entirely unprotected, and therefore, the order herein impugned in so far as it relates to the Applicant is stayed till further orders.

Issue notice returnable on 18.10.2016.

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

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

This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

The service may be done by hand delivery / speed post / courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

S.O. to 18th October, 2016. Hamdast.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) 20.9.16
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

DATE: 20/9/16.
CORAM:
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J
APPEARANCE:
Shri/Smt. K.R. Jagdale
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri K.B. Bhise
~~C.P.O.~~ P.O. for the Respondents
~~Adj. To:~~ S.O. to 18/10/16.
Hamdast.

2

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

DATE : 20/9/16

CORAM :

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

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

APPEARANCE :

~~Shri/Smt.~~ : Kavita Pawar

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri ~~Smt.~~ : K. B. Bhise

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

~~Adj. to~~ S.O. to 22/9/16.

O.A.920/2016

Shri D.B. Wadile ... Applicant

Vs.

The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Smt. Kavita Pawar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Issue notice returnable on 22.09.2016.

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

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

This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

The service may be done by hand delivery / speed post / courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within four weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

S.O. to 22nd September, 2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
20.09.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.

..... Applicant/s

rocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

senting Officer.....)

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

20/9/2016

Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)

~~Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member)~~ A

AMCR:

B.R. Deshmukh

for the Applicant

Archana B.K.

for the Respondent/s No.1 to 6 and Pritam Ohol, holding for Shri S.A. Misal

26/9/2016

20/9/2016

CM:

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

~~Hon'ble Shri Rajeev Agarwal~~ (Member) A

Pritam Ohol holding for Adv. S.A. Misal.

Archana B.K. for Respondent No.1 to 6

for the Respondent/s

Md. Shri. Pritam Ohol holding for Shri. S.A. Misal.

26/9/2016

Date : 20.09.2016.

O.A.No.307 of 2016

B.R. Khedkar **.... Applicant**

Versus

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

1. Heard Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents No.1 to 6 and Shri Pritam Ohol, the learned Advocate holding for Shri S.A. Misal, the learned Advocate for Respondent No.7.

2. Shri B.R. Deskmukh, the learned Advocate for the Applicant is absent.

3. At the request of learned Advocate Shri Pritam Ohol holding for Shri S.A. Masal who appears for Respondent No.7, adjourned to 26.09.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

.....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

ng Officer.....)

Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, pearance, Tribunal's orders or ections and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders

Date : 20.09.2016.

O.A.No.187 of 2016
(Subject : Non payment of pay and allowances)

V.S. Nawale **.... Applicant.**

Versus

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

1. Heard Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant, Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for Respondent No.1 and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents No.3 & 4.

2. In the midst of hearing, learned Advocate Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar for the Applicant states as follows :-

> Liberty to withdraw the O.A. in order to ascertain the exact cause of action and if advised file fresh and suitable claim, may be granted.

3. O.A. is disposed as withdrawn, with liberty as indicated.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi) 20/9/16

Chairman

prk

20/9/2016

...hi (Chairman)

...mber) A

B.A. Bandiwadekar

K.S. Gaikwad

A. is disposed as

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

O.A.No.541 of 2015 with M.A.No.111 of 2016

Y.C. Korande **.... Applicant.**

Versus

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

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

2. Shri P.G. Kayande, the learned Advocate for the Applicant is absent.

3. Learned P.O. Smt. K.S. Gaikwad for the Respondents on instructions from Shri A.G. Mankar, Assistant Section Officer, states as follows :-

(a) The vacancy position is being ascertained and the Department is of the view that the endevour would be made to accommodate the applicant according to his choice.

(b) Time is required for making a statement.

4. Time as prayed for is granted.

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

6. S.O. to 05.10.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

[P.T.O.

DATE: 20/9/2016
CORAM:
Hon'ble [illegible] A.H. Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble ——————— (A)
A.P.:
Shri / P.G. Kayande
Adv.:
Shri: K.S. Gaikwad
C.P.O.:

Adj. To 05/10/2016
Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed. (R)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 20.09.2016. **C.A.No.117 of 2015 in O.A.No.919 of 2014** **Shri Y.B. Khade ...Applicant** **Vs.** **The State of Mah. & Ors. ...Respondents** **With** **M.A.No.526 of 2015 in O.A.No.919 of 2014** **The State of Mah. & Ors. ...Applicant (Org. Respondents)** **Vs.** **Shri Y.B. Khade ...Respondent (Org. Applicant)** 1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, adjourned to 29.09.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman sba

DATE : 20/9/2016
CORAM :
Hon'ble ... Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble ... (Member) A
APP:
Smt. Punam Mahajan.
A.G.
S/Shri K.S. Gaikwad
C.P.O/P.S.O/S
Adj. To 29/9/2016

[P.T.O.

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

C.A.No.85 of 2015 in O.A.No.383 of 2015

Shri D.S. Rajput ...Applicant

Vs.

The State of Mah. & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri S.K. Naire, learned Special Counsel with Shri K.B. Bhie, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Special Counsel Shri S.K. Naire who appears for the Contemnor states as follows:-

(a) That the order passed by this Tribunal in O.A.No.383 of 2015 is carried before the Hon'ble High Court.

(b) The Writ Petition filed by the State is admitted and impugned order has been stayed.

3. Adjourned to 28.09.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

DATE : 20/9/2016
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice [illegible] Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble [illegible] (Member) A
A[illegible] Punam Mahajan
A[illegible]
Shri [illegible] S. K. Naire, Spl. Counsel with Shri. K.B. Bhise
Counsel
Adj. To 28/9/2016

[P.T.O.

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

C.A.No.130 of 2015 in O.A.No.308 of 2012

S.S. Padave **...Applicant**

Vs.

The State of Mah. & Ors. **...Respondents**

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

2. Learned P.O. for the Respondents Smt. K.S. Gaikwad states as follows:-

(a) The matter is placed before the Cabinet and a week's time is required.

(b) Simultaneously, S.L.P. is filed by the State which will come up for hearing shortly.

3. Learned P.O. for the Respondents prays for two weeks time.

4. Time as prayed for is granted.

5. In view of the request of learned P.O. for the Respondents, the hearing is adjourned to 5.10.2016.

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

sba

DATE : 20/9/2016
CORAM :
Hon'ble [illegible] (Chairman)
Ho[illegible]mber) A
A
S[illegible] B.A. Bandiwadekar
A
S[illegible] K.S. Gaikwad.....
C[illegible]
Adj. To 5/10/2016

[P.T.O.

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
DATE : 20/9/2016 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri ... (Member)~~ A APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. Tanaji Jadhav, holding for Adv. Shri. R. K. Mendadkar. Advocate for Applicant Shri/Smt. Ms. S. Suryawanshi C.P.O. for Respondent/s Adj. To 27/9/2016	**Date : 20.09.2016.** **O.A.No.892 of 2015** **B.K. Thumbare .... Applicant.** **Versus** **The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ....Respondents.** 1. Heard Shri Tanaji Jadhav, the learned Advocate Shri R.K. Mendadkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. By consent adjourned to 27.09.2016. Sd/- **(A.H. Joshi, J.)** **Chairman** prk

(PTO

Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders

Date : 20.09.2016.

O.A.No.626 of 2015 with O.A.No.628 of 2015

M.S. Chavan (O.A.No.626/2015)
V.V. Badade (O.A.No.628/2015) .... Applicants.

Versus

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

1. Heard Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Advocate for the Applicants Ms. S.P. Manchekar states that issue involved in this case has attained finality in the judgment delivery by Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No.7062/2014 with W.P.No.5766 /2015, W.P.No.4506/2015, W.P.No.2364/2015, W.P.No. 2369/2015, W.P.No.2263/2015, W.P.No.9152/2015, W.P. No.9153/2015, W.P.No.9154/2015, W.P.No.9155/2015, with Civil Application No.337/2015 in W.P.No.7062/2014 with Civil ApplicationNo.339/2015 in W.P.No.7062/2014, dated 24.06.2016.

3. Learned Advocate for the Applicants Ms. S.P. Manchekar therefore states that the said judgment would govern the issue involved in this case as well.

4. Learned P.O. for the Respondents Shri K.B. Bhise is called to state as to the way the Government would like to be governed by the judgment of Hon'ble High Court.

5. Steno copy is allowed to learned P.O.. Learned P.O. is directed to communicate this order to the Respondents.

6. S.O. to 18.10.2016.

— Sd/ —
(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

DATE : 20/9/2016
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice A.H. Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble [illegible] (Member) A
Ms. S.P. Manchekar
Shri K.B. Bhise
C.P.O.

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

O.A.No.679 of 2015
(Subject : Recovery)

S.S. Kerle .... **Applicant.**

Versus

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

1. Heard Shri S.J. Chaurasia (Ashoka Law Firm), the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. In the midst of hearing, learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri S.J. Chaurasia states as follows :-

(a) The disciplinary proceedings have resulted in penalty.

(b) Applicant has carried the appeal against the order of penalty.

(c) Appeal is heard.

(d) Applicant wants to wait till the decision of appeal pursuing the cause for allowance relating to period of suspension when main issue would be agitated.

3. In view of the foregoing, learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri S.J. Chaurasia prays for leave to withdraw this O.A. with liberty to file afresh with remedy as available in law.

4. O.A. is dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as agitated.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

DATE : 20/9/2016
CORAM :
Hon'ble [illegible] Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble [illegible] (Member) A
APP :
[illegible] Chaurasia

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	Date : 20.09.2016. **M.A.No.251 of 2016 in O.A.No.660 of 2015 (N'pur) with** **M.A.No.252 of 2016 in O.A.No.661 of 2015 (N'pur) with** **M.A.No.253 of 2016 in O.A.No.827 of 2015 (A'bad)** **M.S. Joshi & Ors. (M.A.No.251/2016 in O.A.No.660/2015)** **S.B. Korke & Ors. (M.A.No.252/2016 in O.A.No.661/2015)** **M.S. Joshi & Ors. (M.A.No.253/2016 in O.A.No.827/2015)** **...Applicants** **Vs.** **The State of Maha. & Ors. ...Respondents** 1. Heard Shri V.P. Potbhare, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. At the request of learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri V.P. Potbhare, adjourned to 20.10.2016. — Sd/— **(A.H. Joshi, J.)** **Chairman** sba

DATE : 20/9/2016

CORAM :

Hon'ble [illegible] (Chairman)

Hon'ble [illegible] Member(A)

V. P. Potbhare

A. J. Chougule

Adj. To 20/10/2016

[P.T.O.

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. ..... of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicants

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondents

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

C.A.No.116 of 2014 in O.A.No.03 of 2013

Shri S.R. Pimpatkar & Ors. ...Applicants

Vs.

The State of Mah. & Ors. ...Respondents

1. Heard Shri J.N. Kamble, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri D.B. Khaire, the learned Special Counsel with Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Special Counsel for the Respondents Shri D.B. Khaire prays for two days time for enabling him to make a statement for reporting the steps for completion of the implementation of the order.

3. At the request learned Special Counsel for the Respondents Shri D.B. Khaire, adjourned to 21.09.2016.

4. S.O. to 21.09.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

DATE : 20/9/16

CORAM :

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

~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh(kumar (Member) A~~

ATTENDANCE :

Shri/Smt. : J.N. Kamble

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. : D.B. Khaire sp.counsel

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

with N.G. Gohad, P.O. for Rspts

Adj. To 21/9/16

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
DATE : 20/9/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member)-A APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad Advocate for the Applicant (Org. Resp.) Shri/Smt. : B.A. Bandiwadekar C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondent/s (Org. Appl.) Adj. To 21/9/16.	**Date : 20.09.2016.** **R.A.No.02 of 2016 in O.A.No.956 of 2014 with 957 of 2014 and 958 of 2014** **The General Manager,** **Brihan Mumbai Milk Scheme & Ors.** **...Applicants (Org. Respondents)** **Vs.** **Shri S.T. Tiwari & Ors. ...Respondents (Org. Applicants)** 1. Heard Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Org. Respodents) and Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Respondents (Org. Applicants). 2. Review Application be listed for hearing on 21.09.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman sba

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

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No. ..... of 20 DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
DATE : 20/9/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakumar (Member) A APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad Advocate for the Applicant Corp. Resp.) Shri/Smt. : B.A. Bandiwadekar C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondent/s Corp Appl Adj. To MA is allowed. sba	**Date : 20.09.2016.** **M.A.No.40 of 2016 in R.A.No.02 of 2016 in O.A.No.956 of 2014 with 957 of 2014 and 958 of 2014** **The General Manager, Brihan Mumbai Milk Scheme & Ors. ...Applicants (Org. Respondents)** **Vs.** **Shri S.T. Tiwari & Ors. ...Respondents (Org. Applicants)** 1. Heard Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Org. Respodents) and Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Respondents (Org. Applicants). 2. Review Application is delayed by 2 and ½ years. 3. The reasons stated in application are satisfactory. 4. Delay caused in filing application is condoned. 5. Misc. Application is allowed. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman

(Advocate .....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 20.09.2016.

M.A.No.549 of 2014 in C.A.No.1433 of 2014 (N'pur) in O.A.No.663 of 2012 (N'pur)
(Civil Appeal No.361 of 2014 N'pur)

J.M. Mankar **...Applicant**

Vs.

The State of Mah. & Ors. **...Respondents**

1. None for the Applicant. Heard Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. At the request of learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents Shri K.B. Bhise, adjourned to 21.09.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

sba

DATE : 20/9/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member) A
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : None for the Appl.
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise
C.P.O. / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 21/9/16