(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

C.A.85/2016 in O.A.284/2016

Shri V.V Wadekar ... Applicant
V/s.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned P.O. for the Respondents.

An order dated 25th October, 2016 (today) is presented for our perusal. The same is taken on record. The Applicant has been promoted, and therefore, the sting of the contempt proceeding has been blunted. While disposing it of, we make it clear that the Applicant shall be at liberty to make an appropriate application, if so advised for deemed date which if and when presented shall be dealt with appropriately and expeditiously. No order as to costs.

DATE : 25/10/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL (Vice-Chairman)~~
Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)
APPEARANCE :
Shri/~~Smt.~~ K.R. Jagdale
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri/Smt.~~ Ms. N.G. Gohad
~~C.P.O./P.O.~~ for the Respondents
~~Adj. To~~ C.A. is disposed of

Sd/- Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman
25.10.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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: 25/10/16

CORAM:

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

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

APPEARANCE:

~~Shri/Smt.~~ Punam Mahajan

Advocate for the Applicant

~~Shri/Smt.~~ Ms. N.G. Gohad

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

~~Adj. to~~ S.O. to 15/11/16.

C.A.80/2016 in O.A.517/2015

Shri R.B. More ... Applicant

V/s.

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

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned P.O. for the Respondents.

We hasve perused the order of this Tribunal presided over by the Hon'ble Chairman of 26th April, 2016. The learned PO submits that the matter was carried to the Hon'ble High Court, but no stay has been granted. In the meanwhile, the matter has been processed, but there are some objections of the AG which are being addressed to. In this set of circumstances, she submits that three weeks time needs to be granted for compliance. We should have thought that there should be an Affidavit setting out these facts, but we still in the interest of justice grant last change for compliance making it clear that if the compliance is not made by then, there will be no other-go but to proceed further in the contempt matter.

S.O. to 15th November, 2016.

Sd/- Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) (Rajiv Agarwal)
Member (J) Vice-Chairman
25.10.2016 25.10.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.

[Spl.- MAT-F-2 E.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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 C.A. No.58 of 2016 in O.A. No.422 of 2014
DATE : 25/10/16. CORAM : Hon'ble Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) Hon'ble Shri Rajiv Agarwal (Vice-Chairman) APPEARANCE : Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant Shri M.S. Gohad C.P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 22/11/2016.	Shri S.B. Pawaskar ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents Heard Shri B.A. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Miss Neelima Gohad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Shri Bandiwadekar, Ld. Advocate for the applicant prays for adjournment on the ground that he wants to prepare. 3. S.O. to 22.11.2016. sd/- (Rajiv Agarwal) Vice-Chairman 25.10.2016 sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman 25.10.2016 (sgj)

[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

C.A.87/2016 in O.A.44/2016

Shri T.P. Rathod ... Applicant
V/s.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned P.O. for the Respondents.

In our opinion, a show cause notice for contempt is required to be issued just for the asking. We made the order on 9.8.2016 in finally disposing of the OA. The present Respondents alleged Contemnors were directed to convene a meeting of the review DPC to consider the case of the Applicant for promotion to the post of Executive Engineer on the basis of the select list of 1.9.2014 as per our observations therein. Time of one month was given for compliance. That time expired on 10.9.2016 (in fact 09.9.2016 itself). The Contempt Application for intended contempt action was served on the alleged Contemnors on 30.9.2016. The learned PO Smt. Gaikwad now informs that on 17th October, 2016 which is just the other day, a Writ Pettion has been lodged and it will come up before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court on 21st November, 2016. In fact, she seeks deferment of any order being made hereon.

It is absolutely clear that the Writ Petition was lodged as recently as on 17th October, 2016. There is no order of stay from the Hon'ble High Court. The order on the OA is such as was capable of being complied with, subject to rights and contentions even if the Writ Petitino was in contemplation. We are absolutely clear in our mind that there is just no cause made out to stay our hands in the matter. The orders of the judicial forum are required to be complied with

[P.T.O.

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

and that would be so even if challenge thereto was contemplated because at least in the cases like the present one, the Respondents would not have got concluded irretrievably, if they had complied with the order of this Tribunal. For the present, we decide against issuance of the show cause notice to the 2nd Respondent – Chief Secretary and direct the show cause of initiation of contempt action to the Respondent No.1 – Shri Ashish Kumar Sinh, Pricipal Secretary, PWD, State of Maharashtra returnable on 16th November, 2016. Hamdast.

DATE : 25/10/16
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.~~ R.S. Gaikwad
~~C.P.O./P.O.~~ for the Respondents
~~Adj. To :~~ S.O. to 16/11/16.

Sd/- Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman
25.10.2016

(skw)

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.482 OF 2016

DISTRICT : NASHIK

Shri Kuber Govindrao More.)
Occu.: Retired Govt. Servant, Residing at)
C-2/18, Siddhivinayak Society,)
Opp. Sharanpur Road Police Station,)
Trambak Road, Nashik – 2.)...**Applicant**

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra.)
Through Principal Secretary,)
Higher & Technical Education Dept.,)
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 400 032.)

2. Principal Secretary,)
Social & Special Justice,)
Mantralaya, Mumbai – 400 032.)

3. The Director (Training),)
Vocational Education and Training)
Directorate, 3, Mahapalika Marg,)
Mumbai 400 001.)

4. The Commissioner.)
Handicap Welfare Directorate (Admn.)
Church Road, Social Welfare)
Direcetorate Campus, Pune.)

5. The Joint Director of Education &)
Training, Regional Office,)
Near Adivasi Vikas Bhavan,)
Near Trambak Naka, Nashik – 2.)...**Respondents**

Applicant in Person.

Ms. Savita Suryawanshi, Presenting Officer for Respondents.

P.C. : R.B. MALIK (MEMBER-JUDICIAL)

DATE : 25.10.2016

ORDER BELOW APPLICATION FOR TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH

1. This application is presented by the Applicant in effect to get directions for the Respondents to furnish to him the Marathi Translation of the Affidavits and other documents because he has no proper felicity in English language.

2. The Applicant has presented some G.Rs including the one dated 14th July, 2010 which make it mandatory for the subordinate Courts to use Marathi as official language.

3. The Respondents have filed a detailed Affidavit-in-reply opposing this application.

4. I have heard the Applicant in person and Ms. Savita Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

5. The Respondents have relied upon and in my view rightly Rule 3 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 which has been quoted in the 3rd Paragraph of their Affidavit-in-reply. It lays down that the language of the Tribunal, "shall be English", but by a proviso, the parties have been given liberty to file documents drawn up in Marathi, if they so desired and by a further proviso, the Bench in its discretion may permit the use of Marathi in the proceedings, "however, the final order shall be in English". Rule 3(b) reserves for the Bench, the discretion to direct English Translation of pleadings and documents to be filed.

6. Without going into the detailed discussion with regard to the status of a judicial forum, it is clear that this Tribunal is subject to the writ jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in view of the Judgment in the matter of **L. Chandrakumar Vs. Union of India, (1997) 3 SCC**

261, but in the sense, the word, "subordinate court" is understood, this Tribunal may not fall within that category and that will be one of the reasons why all the Rules with regard to the language applicable to the subordinate courts will not be applicable to the proceedings before this Tribunal. The Applicant seeks a direction, a mandate as it were for the Respondents to furnish Marathi Translation of the Affidavits and other documents. The Rule that governs the matter of language grants liberty to a party to file the documents drawn up in Marathi and by a further proviso, the Bench in its discretion may permit use of Marathi in the proceedings. However, a final order has got to be in English and not only that, but the Bench hearing the matter in its discretion can also direct English Translation of pleadings and documents. That being the state of affairs, I am of the view that the directions such as the one herein sought by the Applicant cannot be given. Ms. Savita Suryawanshi, the learned P.O told me that the Applicant has been working in the senior clerical staff for quite some time and it is not possible to believe that he does not even have the basic working knowledge of English language. I do not feel called upon the record my finding on this aspect of the mater although I must make it clear that the learned P.O's submission cannot just be brushed under the carpet.

7. Therefore, even as the directions such as the one sought by the Applicant cannot be given, but I am still going to do my very best to ensure that the facilities to the extent possible can be extended to the Applicant. I direct the Registrar of this Tribunal to try to extend to the Applicant the legal aid facility as per prevalent Rules in this Tribunal. The concerned authorities may be requested to try and help out the Applicant can in the matter of translation and other aspects, if he is qualified to get legal aid.

8. With these directions, the application for Translation in English stands hereby disposed of with no order as to costs.



(R.B. Malik)
Member-J
25.10.2016

Mumbai
Date : 25.10.2016
Dictation taken by :
S.K. Wamanse.
E:\SANJAY WAMANSE\JUDGMENTS\2016\10 October, 2016\O.A.482.16.w.10.2016.Marathi Translation.doc

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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 C.A. No.101 of 2014 in O.A. No.476 of 2012
DATE: 25/10/16 CORAM Hon A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon ... Rajeshkumar (Member) A~~ Af Shri Dr.V.V.Rane Appl. in person Advocate for the Applicant Shri K.B. Bhise C.P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 27/10/16.	Dr. V.V. Rane ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents Heard Dr. V.V. Rane, Applicant in person and Shri K.B. Bhise, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Ld. PO, on instructions from Dr. Annasaheb Khemnar, Director, Institute of Science, Mumbai, states that matter is reconsidered by the Shri Sitaram Kunte, Principal Secretary, Higher and Technical Education Department, and proper orders are issued and in that background filing of affidavit may be dispensed with. 3. Ld. PO further states that copy of order received from the Government is given to the applicant. 4. S.O. to 27.10.2016. Sd/- (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman 25.10.2016 (sgj)

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

C.A. No.31 of 2016 in O.A. No.914 of 2013

Dr. H.B. Hankare ..Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Heard Miss S.P. Manchekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Ld. PO states that Government has passed order directing that applicant's period of compulsory waiting be treated as period spent on duty.

3. Ld. PO prays for time for reporting compliance as regards preparation & submission of pay bills and approval of Accountant General etc.

4. Whatever steps are to be taken and which are absolutely within the control of Government should be taken and necessary papers be submitted to the Accountant General within 2 days and compliance be reported on 27.10.2016.

5. S.O. to 27.10.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman
25.10.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 25/10/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh kumar Member) A~~
APPEARANCE:
~~Shri~~/Smt. : S.P. Manchekar
Advocate for the Applicant
~~Shri~~/Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondents

Adj. To 27/10/16

(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 C.A. No.47 of 2016 in O.A. No.883 of 2014

Shri M.G. Shaikh ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents.

Heard Shri M.G. Shaikh, Applicant in person and Smt. Archana B.K., learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Ld. PO states that affidavit prepared by the contemnor is received. However, it requires some correction and prays for time for filing proper affidavit in reply.

3. Applicant states that he would not insist on cost and leave it for the Tribunal to decide.

4. In view that his grievance is met, he need not remain present.

5. S.O. to 27.10.2016.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman
25.10.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 25/10/16

CORAM:

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

~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~

APPEARANCE:

~~Shri/Smt.~~ : M. G. Shaikh Appl. in Person.

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri /Smt. : Archana B.K.

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

Adj. To 27/10/16

[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

DATE : 25/10/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE
~~Shri/Smt.~~ A.V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /Smt. : N.K. Rajpurohit
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To 24/11/16.

Date : 25.10.2016.

O.A.No.148 of 2015

R.K. Shirsath .... Applicant.

Versus

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

1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant, Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondent No.1 and Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2.

2. Learned C.P.O. Shri N.K. Rajpurohit for the Respondent No.1 states as follows :-

(a) Applicant's present posting is made in accordance with existing norms.

(b) Applicant's representation is forwarded for comments of the Commissioner, State Excise and action, if any taken would be reported on the next date.

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

4. S.O. to 24.11.2016.

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

prk

[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. No.229 of 2010 with OA. No.126/2016

Smt. V.R. Maske ..Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

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

2. Shri Chetan Agarwal, Ld. Advocate for the applicant states as follows:

(a) The order passed in Review is challenged by the respondents by filing writ petition and the said writ petition is still pending.

(b) Hearing of this OA be adjourned to 4.4.2017.

3. S.O. to 4.4.2017.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman
25.10.2016

(sgj)

DATE: 25/10/16
CORAM:
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE:
Shri : Chetan Agarwal
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /Smt. : K.B. Bhise
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj. To.... 4/4/2017.
(O.A. 126/11)

[P.T.O.

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

Date : 25.10.2016.

O.A.No.1056 of 2015

A.A. Jagdale .... **Applicant.**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & 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. Smt. K.S. Gaikwad for the Respondents states as follows that the officer Shri Avinash Subedar, Controller of Rationing and Director, Civil Supplies is present.

3. According to Shri Avinash Subedar, Controller of Rationing and Director :-

(a) The copy of order is received in his office on 17.10.2016.

(b) He has studied the matter and has taken steps to recommend the applicant's case for promotion as demanded by the Applicant.

(c) Steps as would be taken and time frame within which the action is expected to complete would be reported on the next date.

4. Steps which are required to be completed at the level of the Controller of Rationing and Director, Civil Supplies be completed on or before 09.11.2016 and compliance be reported as well the steps taken by informed to the Applicant.

5. Attendance of the officer, Shri Avinash Subedar, Controller of Rationing and Director on future dates is exempted.

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

7. S.O. to 17.11.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

DATE : 25/10/16
CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE :
Shri/Smt. : B.A. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /Smt. : K.S. Gaikwad
CPO / P.O. for the Respondent/s
Adj. To 1/11/16.

(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 O.A. No.47 of 2015
DATE : 25/10/16 CORAM : ~~Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)~~ ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : C.T. Chandratre ~~Advocate for the Applicant~~ Shri/Smt. : K.B. Bhise C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 16/11/16.	Shri R.M. Ghoge ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents Heard Shri C.T. Chandratre, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Shri Chandratre, Ld. Advocate prays for time. 3. S.O. to 16.11.2016. (A.H. Joshi, J) Chairman 25.10.2016 (sgj)

(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 C.A. No.142 of 2014 in O.A. No.27 of 2003
DATE : 25/10/16 CORAM : Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman) ~~Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE : Shri/Smt. : None for the appl. Advocate for the Applicant Shri /Smt. : Mr. K. Rajpurohit C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s Adj. To 15/12/2016 (sgj)	Smt. U.P. Paradkar & Ors. ..Applicant Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents Heard Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. Ld. CPO states that the writ petition filed by the State challenging the order passed in OA is expected to come up for hearing on 25.11.2016. 3. S.O. to 15.12.2016. (A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman 25.10.2016

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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.999/2016

Shri R.S. Patil ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Reserving the right of the Applicant to renew the request for interim relief on the next date, issue notice returnable on 29.11.2016.

Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall 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 29th November, 2016.

Sd/-
(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(skw)

DATE: 25/10/16
CORAM: Shri R.B. Malik (Mlg)
Hon'ble ~~Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)~~
~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesh Kumar (Member) A~~
APPEARANCE:
Shri/Smt. M.D. Lonkar
Advocate for the Applicant
Shri /Smt. N.K. Rajpurohit
C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s
Adj. To 29/11/16.

(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 : 25/10/16

CORAM : Shri R.B. Malik

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

~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramesikumar (Member) A~~

APPEARANCE :

Shri/Smt. : D.B. Khaire

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri /Smt. : K.B. Bhise

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

Adj. To.....8/11/16.....

R.A.29/2016 in O.A.266/2016

Shri R.K. Kunjir ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

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

Issue notice returnable on 08.11.2016.

Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall 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 08th November, 2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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: 25/10/16

CORAM: Shri R.B.Malik (MJ)

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

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

APPEARANCE:

Shri/Smt. Punam Mahajan

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. D.B.Khaire ld.spl.counsel

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

with K.S.Gaikwad, P.O. for Resp.

Adj. To. Adv. M.R.Patil for

R.no. 19,44, 27 & 31.

Adv. A.V.Bandiwadekar for R.38

Admit.

O.A.912/2015

Shri S.G. Deshpande & Ors. ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicants, Shri D.B. Khaire, the learned Special Counsel with Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents, Shri M.R. Patil, the learned Advocate for Respondent Nos.19, 44, 27 & 31 and Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for Respondent No.38.

Affidavit-in-rejoinder 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)
25.10.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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 : 25/10/16

CORAM : Shri R.B.Malik (m/j)

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

~~Hon'ble Shri B. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~

AP[illegible]

S.P.Manchekar

Advocate for the Applicant,

Shri [illegible] : K.B.Bhise

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

~~Adj. to~~ I direct that compliance there-with be made in accordance with my order on the OA without waiting for any further proceeding in the matter. Hamdast

BE

O.A.1253/2009

Shri A.A. Tikar & Ors. ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Speaking to Minutes

Hearing the submissions of Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents, the cause for getting this disposed of matter back before me is that while working out the amount of Rs.6 lakhs, only the basic pay was taken into consideration and not the allowances. In my opinion, however, in proceeding for speaking for minutes such an issue cannot be examined. The original Applicant shall be free to adopt a proper proceeding, if so advised for redressal.

Mr. Bhise, the learned PO on instructions from Mr. H.V. Dorve, Sr. Clerk, Office of Addl. Director General of Police, Pune submits that as per the orders on the OA, the necessary calculations have been made and the compliance therewith can be made. I direct that compliance therewith be made in accordance with my order on the OA without waiting for any further proceeding in the matter. Hamdast.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(skw)

(G.C.P.) J 2260 (A) (50,000—2-2015)

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: 25/10/16

CORAM: Shri R.B.Malik (M/J)

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

~~Hon'ble Shri M. Ramakrishnan (Member) A~~

APPEARANCE:

Shri M.D. Lonkar

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri N.K. Rajpurohit

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

Adj. To 29/11/2016.

O.A.990/2016

Shri S.J. Bandekar & Anr. ... Applicants
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Issue notice returnable on 29.11.2016.

Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall 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 29th November, 2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(skw)

[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

(Presentin ; Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
DATE: 25/10/16 CORAM: Shri R.B. Malik (M(J)) Hon'ble ~~Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)~~ Hon'ble ~~Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) A~~ APPEARANCE: ~~Shri/Smt.~~ M.D. Lonkar Advocate for the Applicant Shri /~~Smt.~~ N.K. Rajpurohit C.P.O / P.O. for the Respondent/s ~~Adj. To~~ MA is allowed. BPL	**M.A.418/2016 in O.A.990/2016** **Shri S.J. Bandekar & Anr. ... Applicants** **Vs.** **The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents** Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents. This MA has been filed to sue jointly. As all the Applicants are seeking similar relief, the MA to sue jointly is allowed, subject to payment of Court Fees, if not already paid. Sd/- (R.B. Malik) Member (J) 25.10.2016 (skw)

[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

DATE: 25/10/16

CORAM: Shri R.B.Malik (M/J)

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

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

APPEARANCE:

Shri/Smt.: M. D. Lonkar

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt.: N. K. Rajpurohit

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

Adj. To 29/11/16.

O.A.1000/2016

Shri R.S. Patil ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Reserving the right of the Applicant to renew the request for interim relief on the next date, issue notice returnable on 29.11.2016.

Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall 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 29th November, 2016.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik)
Member (J)
25.10.2016

(skw)

[P.T.O.