

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 style="text-align: center;"><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A 416/2022</u></p> <p>Shri A.S Jage ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri G.A Bandiwadekar, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. At the request of learned counsel for the applicant, adjourned to 4.10.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Akn</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.09.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.551 of 2022</p> <p>S.P. Hire & Ors.Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Mr. Ramakant Paranjape, Mr. Digambar Thakare and Mr. Ajay Pawar, learned Advocates for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Applicants who are working as Sheristedars in the Consumer Court established under Consumer Protection Act 1986 prayer that impugned order dated 12.01.2022 issued at the instance of Respondent No.1 and the process enumerated in MCSR be implemented forthwith. Furhter it is prayed that candidates selected by the Departmental Promotion Committee, but not have given the effect may be effected with retrospective effect.</p> <p>3. However, learned C.P.O. submits that letter dated 12.01.2022 is hereby cancelled by letter dated 16.09.2022 which is annexed with short affidavit-in-reply dated 20.09.2022 filed of behalf Respondent No.1, through Ms. Shital A. Ramteke, Under Secretary, Office of Secretary, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection Department, Mantralaya.</p> <p>4. In view of the said affidavit-in-reply and the letter which is the subject of this application is withdrawn. On query we were informed that the previous DPC was conducted on 08.10.2021. Thus we direct the Respondents to consider the employees from Consumer Court. The said employees are to be considered for the promotion all over Maharashtra in view of cancellation and also the recommendation made in DPC in meeting held on 08.10.2021. This order is to be complied within four weeks.</p> <p>5. Nothing survives in this O.A., O.A. stands disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil) Member(A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

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

of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.09.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.386 of 2022</p> <p>R.P. Satpute ...Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Ms. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Adjourned to 12.10.2022 for hearing on interim relief.</p> <p>Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) / Member(A)</p> <p>Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>prk</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date : 20.09.2022</p> <p>O.A.No.244 of 2017</p> <p>V.R. KoliApplicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. None for the Applicant. Heard Mr. A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned P.O. on instructions from Mr. Sudhir Krishnarao Jayade, Deputy Executive Engineer, Takari Pump House Division No.1, Devrashtre, Tal Kadegaon, District Sangli tenders letter dated 20.09.2022. O.A. was filed for seeking promotion. He submits that Applicant is retired from the service on 31.05.2022. However, he was promoted on 13.08.2018 as Superintendent and posted at Kolhapur. Learned P.O. produces letter received by the office of C.P.O. on 20.09.2022 stating that Applicant has ready been promoted and he retired. Hence, the O.A. can be disposed of.</p> <p>3. Letter dated 20.09.2022 be taken on record and marked as Exhibit-A. In view of this as nothing survives, O.A. stands disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member(A) 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 style="text-align: center;"><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A 1235/2019 with O.A 42/2021, 15 & 532/2022</u></p> <p>Shri M.K. Shivsaran & Ors A.S Tandel A.R Pawar & Ors V.V Navgine</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vs.</p> <p>Secretary, M.P.S.C & Ors</p> <p style="text-align: right;">... Applicants ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Dr Gunratan Sadavarte, learned counsel for the Original Applicants and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents. Ms Janvi Chotai, submits that learned counsel in O.A 42/2021, 15 & 532/2022 do not want to argue and according to them they have completed their submissions.</p> <p>2. We call upon the Expert Committee to show the Rule number and page in B.C.S.R to question no. 4 and 5A and 5B.</p> <p>3. M.P.S.C is called upon to answer to the above query by tomorrow.</p> <p>4. S.O to 21.9.2022 at 2.30 pm.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/-</p> <p>(Medha Gadgil) Member (A)</p> <p>(Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>Akn</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI**

**MISC APPLICATION NO.552 OF 2022
IN
MISC APPLICATION NO.553 OF 2022
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.665 OF 2022**

DISTRICT: MUMBAI

The Superintendent of Police,)
Pune (R), Pune)
Chavan Nagar, Pashan road, Pune – 8)... **Applicant**
(Org. Respondent)

Versus

Gokuldas Babasaheb Shinde,)
R/at. Sai Nagar Gahunje Gaon,)
Tal – Haveli, Dist.-Pune.)... **Respondent**
(Org. Applicant)

**Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Applicant
(Org. Respondent).**

**Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Respondent (Org.
Applicant).**

CORAM : A.P. Kurhekar, Member (J)

DATE : 20.09.2022.

ORDER

1. Heard Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Applicant (Org. Respondent) and Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Respondent (Org. Applicant).

2. M.A. No.552/2022 is filed for condonation of delay caused in filing M.A. No.553/2022 which is filed for recalling the order dated 13.07.2022 passed in O.A. No.665/2022.

Wt

3. The Applicant had filed O.A. No.665/2022 to quash and set aside order dated 22.03.2022 issued by Respondents whereby recovery of Rs.2,50,243/- (Two Lakhs Fifty Thousand Two Hundred and Forty Three Only) sought from his retiral benefits. The Applicant stand retired on 31.08.2021. He is group 'C' employee. It is only after retirement by impugned order dated 22.03.2022 recovery has been sought and his pay has been downgraded.

4. O.A. was taken up for admission on 11.07.2022, on that day it was noticed that recovery *prima-facie* is impermissible in view of decision by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **(2015) 4 SCC 334 (State of Punjab and others Vs. Rafiq Masih (White Washer))**. Learned P.O. also made fair submission that if challenge is to the extent of recovery only, in that event Tribunal may dispose of O.A. in view of judgment of **Rafiq Masih's case (cited supra)**. Learned Advocate for the Applicant however sought two days time to take instruction from the Applicant as to whether challenge is restricted to recovery, matter was accordingly adjourned to 13.07.2022.

5. On 13.07.2022 when the matter was taken up for hearing at the stage of admission, learned Advocate for the Applicant made categorical statement that the challenge is restricted to the excess payment only and he is not challenging re-fixation of pay. That apart, learned P.O. also fairly concedes legal position in view of decision in **Rafiq Masih's case (cited supra)**. The Tribunal recorded the submission advanced by the learned counsel and passed the order thereby setting aside recovery order dated 22.03.2022 to the extent of recovery in view of the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Rafiq Masih's case (cited supra)**. In Para 7, 8, & 9 Tribunal recorded the submission advanced by learned P.O. which is as under:-

"7. Learned P.O. also fairly concedes the legal position that recovery is not permissible. Indeed, Special Inspector General of Police by order dated 05.09.2018 (22 of P.B.) has already given direction to all the Department working under him that in view of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Rafiq Masih's case (cited**

supra) there should not be recovery of excess payment. Despite this position by impugned order dated 22.03.2022 recovery is sought. In this view of the matter, O.A. deserves to be allowed partly.

8. Impugned order dated 22.03.2022 is quashed and set aside to the extent of recovery only.

9. Since, the Applicant's retiral benefits are withheld for long time, Respondent is directed to release all his retiral benefits as per his entitlement within one month from today."

6. It is thus manifest that the legal position was fairly conceded and after hearing learned P.O. matter was disposed.

7. Now these M.As are filed to recall the order *inter-alia* on the ground that the Applicant had given undertaking on 13.05.2009 that he would return excess amount and requested the Tribunal to recall the order dated 13.07.2022 so as to facilitate to file Affidavit-in-Reply and then to decide O.A. on merit. Indeed, no such undertaking dated 13.05.2009 is Annexed to M.A. Be that as it may, this could not be the ground to recall the order in this manner.

8. Admittedly, the Applicant retired as group 'C' employee and recovery is sought after retirement. O.A. was allowed after hearing learned P.O. who fairly concedes legal position. M.A. for recalling order is also not filed within limitation of one month.

9. In view of above, I see no merit in M.As. and those are liable to be dismissed. Both these M.As are accordingly disposed of with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(A.P. Kurhekar)
Member (J)

Place: Mumbai
Date: 20.09.2022
Dictation taken by: N.M. Naik.

**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 align="center"><u>O.A.492/2022</u></p> <p>Shri D.M. Chavan ... Applicant Vs. The State of Mah. & Ors. ... Respondents</p> <p>1. A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. A.B. Kololgi, learned P.O. for Respondents is present.</p> <p>2. The learned Advocate for the Applicant tenders Affidavit-in-Rejoinder. The same is taken on record.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 12.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member-J 20.09.2022</p> <p>(skw)</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.754 of 2022</p> <p>Dr. S.L. PawarApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, learned Advocate for the Applicant, Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents and Smt. Anjali Kolapkar, learned Advocate holding for A.S. Gaikwad, learned Advocate for the Respondent No.3.</p> <p>2. Today learned Advocate for the Applicant has filed Affidavit-in-Rejoinder on behalf of the Applicant. It is taken on record.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 04.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

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

of 20

IN

Original Application No.

of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.660 of 2022</p> <p>Dr. Y.M. KokadwarApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Today learned Advocate for the Applicant has filed Affidavit-in-Rejoinder on behalf of the Applicant. It is taken on record.</p> <p>3. Interim relief to continue till next date.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 04.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

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

of 20

IN

Original Application No.

of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.328 of 2022</p> <p>M. Venkatesh & Ors.Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant and his Advocate both are absent. Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents is present. The matter is for hearing without Reply since the Respondents fail to file Affidavit-in-Reply in time granted by the Tribunal. However, today learned P.O. sought permission to tender Affidavit-in-Reply. In the interest of justice allowed to file Affidavit-in-Reply. O.A. be kept for hearing at the stage of admission. S.O. to 11.10.2022. <p align="right">Sd/- W (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A. No.933 of 2022</u></p> <p>P.J. Pawar ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri V.P. Sangvikar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>3. Issue notice before admission returnable on 18.10.2022. The respondents are directed to file reply.</p> <p>4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Private service is allowed. Respondents are put to notice that the case may be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.</p> <p>5. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.</p> <p>6. By Hand delivery, speed post, courier notice to be served and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.</p> <p>7. In case notice is not collected within seven days or service report on affidavit is not filed three days before returnable date, the OA shall be placed on board before the concerned Bench under the caption "For Dismissal" and thereafter on the subsequent date the OA shall stand dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A) 20.9.2022 (sgj)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson 20.9.2022</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 style="text-align: center;"><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>C.A 45/2022 in O.A 65/2020</u></p> <p>S.P Kapdne ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri S.B Bhosale, learned advocate for the applicant and Shri A.J Chougule, learned P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the order of this Tribunal dated 16.2.2022 for counting 1 ½ years' service rendered by the applicant on the post of Sweeper from 4.7.1985 to 9.7.2004 for the purpose of pension and accordingly benefits to be extended to him within two months from the date of the order. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that two months are over on 16.4.2022 and the order is not complied with.</p> <p>3. Affidavit in reply is filed by the Respondents on 15.9.2022. Learned P.O submits that as per the order of the Tribunal, the Respondent no 3, R.T.O, Nasik, has submitted proposal of the applicant to the office of the Accountant General, M.S, Mumbai, on 21.7.2022. Again on 18.9.2022 the Respondent no. 3 has sent reminder to the office of Accountant General, M.S, Mumbai.</p> <p>4. It is the duty of the Respondent no. 3, to comply with the order of this Tribunal. It appears that the proposal was not sent within time.</p> <p>5. S.O to 22.9.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Akn</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><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p><u>M.A 282/2022 in O.A 536/2021</u></p> <p>Smt S.B Sonwane ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri R.G Panchal, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the applicant seeks permission to amend the Original Application as per the schedule.</p> <p>3. Permission grant. Amendment to be carried out within a week and copy to be served on the learned C.P.O.</p> <p>4. Learned C.P.O is granted permission to file affidavit to the amended application.</p> <p>5. S.O to 15.11.2022.</p> <p>Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A) Akn</p> <p>Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</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 style="text-align: center;"><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>M.A 499/2022 in O.A 31/2022</u></p> <p>Shri Yogesh Wagh ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri Yogesh Wagh, applicant in person and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Applicant states that he is working as Assistant Section Officer in Mantralaya and joined his service in the year 2009. He will be completing 15 years on the post of A.S.O in June, 2024. Applicant states that he has completed 45 years of age in June, 2020 and he will be completing 50 years of age in the year 2025. The impugned G.R was issued on 1.3.2018. The Corrigendum was issued on 11.8.2022.</p> <p>3. Learned C.P.O submits that reply is filed to the Original Application and seeks time to file reply to the Misc Application.</p> <p>4. Time granted.</p> <p>5. S.O to 18.10.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p style="text-align: left;">Akn</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><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p><u>O.A 224/2022</u></p> <p>Shri S.H Nikat ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. None present for the applicant. Heard Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Admit. Place for hearing on 15.11.2022.</p> <p>Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A) Akn</p> <p>Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p><u>C.A 23/2022 in O.A 563/2019</u></p> <p>Mohd Husein Hashan Kacchi ... Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Heard Shri M.B Kadam, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. In this Contempt Application the Respondent-State was expected to comply with the order of the Tribunal dated 2.3.2022 wherein the Tribunal directed to fix the responsibility for delayed payment of retirement benefits to the applicant such as payment of gratuity, leave encashment, GIS and commutation of pension. It was further directed to fix the responsibility and the applicant should be paid the interest at the approved rate for the delayed payment within a period of four weeks.</p> <p>3. The applicant retired on 28.2.2011. The applicant was given full Provisional Pension from March, 2011 to February 2012. Thereafter, he was given regular pension and other retirement dues from 6.12.2013. Learned C.P.O submits that whatever gap was there of 1 ½ years the interest was paid to the applicant. The persons who were found responsible for the delay, notice was given to them and the Respondent-State has taken action against them. Learned C.P.O submits that the order of this Tribunal has been complied with.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel submits that there is dispute on the interest on commutation of pension.</p> <p>5. We verified the fact from both the counsel. It reveals that the applicant was given the full Provisional Pension from 6.12.2013. He applied for 30% commutation of pension in the year 2014. However, the said application was not decided and his 30% pension was commuted on 16.10.2019.</p> <p>6. Under such circumstances, when the applicant was paid full provisional pension, there is no question of paying interest on the commuted amount of pension. 30% amount of pension was commuted from 2019. Hence the order of this Tribunal has been complied with.</p> <p>7. In view of the above, C.A stands disposed of.</p> <p>Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A)</p> <p>Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson</p> <p>Akn</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p align="center"><u>O.A. No.711 of 2020 & O.A. No.712 of 2020</u></p> <p>R.K. Kudtarkar & Ors. S.V. Kolvankar & Ors. ..Applicants Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri Sandeep Dere, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Ld. Advocate for the applicants submits that case of the applicants is covered by the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No.4867/1984 (paras 9 to 12) with W.P. No.5030/1984 decided on 18.10.1991 reported in 1992 LAB.I.C.748 : 1991 Mh.L.J.1557, The State of Maharashtra Vs. M.V. Ghalge & Anr.</p> <p>3. Ld. CPO to consider this judgment.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 11.10.2022.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (Medha Gadgil) Member (A) 20.9.2022</p> <p align="center">Sd/- (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Chairperson 20.9.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

Original Application No.

of 20

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate.....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

(Presenting Officer.....)

..... Respondent/s

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p><u>20.09.2022</u></p> <p><u>M.A 388/2022 in O.A 1235/2019</u></p> <p>Shri M.K. Shivsaran & Ors ... Applicants Vs. Secretary, M.P.S.C & Ors ... Respondents AND Dipak D. Chavan ... Applicant Vs. Secretary, M.P.S.C & Ors ... Respondents</p> <p>1. Shri Sandip Gaikwad and Nilam Sawane, learned advocates for the applicant absent. Heard Dr Gunratan Sadavarte, learned counsel for the Original Applicants in O.A 1235/2019 and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The Misc Application is moved by the learned counsel for the applicant stating therein that the case of the applicant is at par with the applicants in O.A 1235/2019. Therefore, the applicant is also to be added as applicant in O.A 1235/2019.</p> <p>3. It appears that the applicant wants to be part in O.A 1235/2019. He cannot be added as a applicant, because the learned counsel appearing for the applicants in O.A 1235/2019 is different than Mr Gaikwad and Nilam Sawane.</p> <p>4. However, the Misc Application is allowed in order to avoid multiplicity of proceedings. Hence the applicant in the Misc Application is to be added as a formal party Respondent no. 4 in O.A 1235/2019.</p> <p>5. M.A accordingly stands disposed of.</p> <p>Sd/- Sd/-</p> <p>(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson</p> <p>Akn</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20 _____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p align="center"><u>O.A. No.752 of 2022</u></p> <p>N.R. Garje ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Ld. Advocate for the applicant refers to page 154 of OA (relevant page 160) which is note of Revenue & Forest Department and submits that sealed cover was opened and applicant was found fit for promotion. The applicant is exonerated.</p> <p>3. Ld. CPO files affidavit in reply dated 19.9.2022 of Geeta R. Kulkarni, Deputy Secretary, GAD and the same is taken on record.</p> <p>4. Closed for orders.</p> <p align="center">Sd/- Sd/-</p> <p align="center">(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson 20.9.2022 20.9.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A. No.930 of 2022</u></p> <p>D.S. Kamtekar ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents</p> <p>Heard Shri Ganesh S. Masurkar holding for Shri C.T. Chandratre, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. The office objections, if any, are to be removed and court fees to be paid, if not already paid.</p> <p>3. Issue notice before admission returnable on 15.11.2022. The respondents are directed to file reply.</p> <p>4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Private service is allowed. Respondents are put to notice that the case may be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.</p> <p>5. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.</p> <p>6. By Hand delivery, speed post, courier notice to be served and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.</p> <p>7. In case notice is not collected within seven days or service report on affidavit is not filed three days before returnable date, the OA shall be placed on board before the concerned Bench under the caption "For Dismissal" and thereafter on the subsequent date the OA shall stand dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Medha Gadgil) (Mridula Bhatkar, J.) Member (A) Chairperson 20.9.2022 20.9.2022</p> <p>(sgj)</p>


**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20 _____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.458 of 2021</p> <p>A.R. SalunkheApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant and his Advocate both are absent. 2. Shri S.K. Hande, learned Advocate for the Applicant has sent his leave note. 3. Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents is present. 4. Adjourned for Final Hearing. 5. S.O. to 07.10.2022. <p align="right">  Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J) </p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.800 of 2022</p> <p>R.A. BhaleraoApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, learned Advocate for the Applicant, Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents and Shri Sarafay Shaikh, learned Advocate for Respondent No.4.</p> <p>2. On request of learned Counsel for Respondents, two weeks time is granted to file Affidavit-in-Reply.</p> <p>3. S.O. to 04.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20 _____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.418 of 2022</p> <p>V.R. Mirajkar & Ors.Applicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. Already enough chances are granted to file Affidavit-in-Reply but the same is not filed. On previous date also one week time was granted by way of most last chance but in vain. Hence, I am not inclined to grant further time.</p> <p>3. O.A. be kept for hearing at the stage of admission without Reply.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 18.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20 _____

I N

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">O.A. No.226 of 2022 to O.A. No.230 of 2022 with O.A. No.259 of 2022</p> <p>N.L. Yevage S.K. Randive P.R. Kadarkar S.A. Kamble D.N. Wable W.M. DsouzaApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer holding for Ms. S.P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents</p> <p>2. In these group of O.As Affidavit-in-Reply is filed in O.A. No.226/2022, 228/2022 & 230/2022 but no Reply is filed in remaining O.A. i.e. O.A. No.227/2022, 229/2022 & 259/2022 though enough time is granted. Hence, I am not inclined to grant further time.</p> <p>3. O.A. be kept for Final Hearing.</p> <p>4. S.O. to 18.10.2022.</p> <p align="right">Sd/- (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

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

I N

Original Application No. of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
	<p>Date: 20.09.2022</p> <p align="center">M.A. No.461 of 2022 in O.A. No.554 of 2022</p> <p>Dr. P.P. GaikwadApplicant Versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant and his Advocate both are absent. 2. Shri J.S. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the Applicant has sent his leave note. 3. Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents is present. 4. On request of learned P.O. two weeks time is granted to file Affidavit-in-Reply to M.A. 5. S.O. to 04.10.2022. <p align="right">Sd/- V'' (A.P. Kurhekar) Member (J)</p> <p>NMN</p>