

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH**

**MISC APPLICATION NO 187 OF 2020  
IN  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO 226 OF 2019**

**DISTRICT : THANE**

Shri Prasad L. Khairnar & Others )...**Applicants**

**Versus**

The State of Maharashtra & Others )...**Respondents**

Smt Punam Mahajan, learned advocate for the Applicants.

Ms Swati Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

**CORAM** : **Justice Mridula R. Bhatkar (Chairperson)**  
**Shri P.N Dixit (Vice-Chairman) (A)**

**DATE** : **30.07.2020**

**PER** : **Justice Mridula R. Bhatkar (Chairperson)**

**ORDER**

1. Heard Smt Punam Mahajan , learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. This M.A is filed by two applicants, i.e. Original Applicant no. 1 and no. 4 out of the total four Original Applicants.

3. All the four applicants pray that they are to be considered for promotion to the higher post in the department of Social Welfare, i.e. Respondent no. 2. All these four applicants were selected and appointed in August, 2014 as Social Welfare Officer. As per rule 4 of the Rules of September, 1975, issued by Social Welfare, Cultural Affairs, Sports and Tourism Department, about the Departmental Examinations for continuation of appointments and for the promotion to higher posts it is necessary for the employees working in the same

department to clear the Departmental examination within a period of two years from the date of appointment or promotion.

Rule 10 states as follows:-

“Two more chances shall be given to the officers who have failed to pass the Departmental Examination accordingly the rules hitherto in force.”

Rule 15 states as under:

“The examination shall be held by the Maharashtra Public Service Commission once in a year in July on the dates notified by the Commission.”

4. As per the pleading and the submissions, it is pointed out to us that the Departmental Examinations was not carried out within two years from the appointment of the applicants, i.e. upto 2016. The Departmental Examination was conducted in May, 2017 and results were declared on 10.1.2018 in which both the applicants in the present M.A and original applicant no. 2 could not clear in the first attempt. Thereafter, second examination was conducted on 22.1.2019. The results of the second examination was declared in December, 2019, wherein the two applicants in the present M.A, i.e. Original Applicant no. 1, 4 and Original Applicant no. 2 cleared the examination in second attempt, but, Original applicant no. 3 failed in second attempt also. However, in between the department issued the order of ad hoc promotions of the Social Welfare Officers to the higher post of Assistant Commissioner.

5. Learned Counsel for the applicants showed the list of the employees, though junior to the present applicants in MPSC rank as well as final seniority list were given ad hoc promotions from 28.5.2019. It is further relied and pointed out, the order dated 15.6.2020 issued by the Respondent no. 2 of clearing the probation period of the three Original Applicant no. 1, cleared on 5.9.2016, applicant no. 2 cleared on 13.9.2016 and applicant no. 4 cleared on 27.9.2016, as they had joined the service in the year 2014. Learned Counsel for the applicants argued that though as per the rules of 1975, it is necessary for the employees to pass the departmental examination within two years from the date of his appointment. However, in the present case no departmental examination was conducted within two years. Therefore, the applicants could not clear the examinations within two years. However, they have cleared the examination in second attempt and they are shown as permanent and therefore, they are to be promoted and shown on the higher rank as per MPSC and seniority list.

6. Learned CPO submits that the MPSC has filed the reply to O.A on 4.7.2019 justifying their action of not conducting the departmental examination within two years. However, she confirms that the three Original Applicants have been given the clearance in probation and submits that as per the rules, the Respondents will consider the case of these three applicants, Original Applicant nos 1, 2 and 4.

7. Respondents-State to file reply to the Original Application

8. Admittedly, the departmental examination was not conducted within two years as prescribed in the rules. Therefore, not clearing the departmental examination within the stipulated period was not possible for the applicants. So also it is not disputed that the applicants did not clear the examination in first attempt. However, rule 10 facilitates such candidates/employees to clear the examination thereafter in two more chances. The three Original Applicants have cleared the examination in the second attempt. The order of clearing of probation period is rather more important to support the claim of these applicants for their consideration for promotion as claimed in their reply.

9. In view of this submission and the Rules, the list of order of clearing the probation by applicants no 1, 2 and 4, this M.A can be disposed of with following directions:-

- (a) The Respondents to consider the case of Original Applicant nos 1 and 4 who are applicant in M.A and also Original Applicant no. 2, whose case is similar to applicants in the M.A.
- (b) Their case is to be considered and Government to take decision on or before 15.10.2020. No further time to be asked.

10. M.A stands disposed of. O.A 2226/2019 adjourned to 3.11.2020.

Sd/-

**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-

**(Mridula R. Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**

**Place : Mumbai**  
**Date : 30.07.2020.**  
**Dictation taken by : A.K. Nair.**





**30.07.2020**

**O.A 969/2019**

Shri T.A Diwan ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri K.R Jagdale, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar , learned P.O for the Respondents.
2. The Respondent-State to comply within three months from the date of the order.
3. S.O to 3.11.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 819 & 820/2019**

Shri V.V Chavan  
Shri A.J Thorat ... Applicants  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri M.D Lonkar, learned advocate for the applicants and Smt K.S Gaikwad, learned P.O for the Respondents.

2. This matter pertains to dismissal of the applicants from service. Learned counsel for the applicants submit that the applicants are already reinstated nearly three months back. Now the issue remains only of arrears of pay and allowances.

3. Learned P.O submits that she will take instructions within two weeks. Time granted.

4. S.O to 25.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 829/2019**

Shri A.P Ghadge & Ors ... Applicants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri Mangal Bhandari i/b Shri Mangesh Deshmukh, learned advocate for the applicants and Smt K.S Gaikwad , learned P.O for the Respondents.

2. Learned P.O files affidavit in reply.

3. S.O to 6.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn



**30.07.2020**

**O.A 1233/2019**

Dr S.B Satpute & Others ... Applicants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri M.R Kulkarni, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms S.P Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. Admit.

3. Place for final hearing on 6.10.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 142/2020**

Smt A.A Kulkarni ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Mrs A.A Kulkarni, applicant in person and Smt K.S Gaikwad, learned P.O for the Respondents.
2. Applicant is going to retire in December, 2020. It is a reversion matter.
3. Learned P.O is directed to file reply on or before 21.8.2020. Reply to be served on the applicant before next date.
4. S.O 27.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 286/2020**

Shri R.Y Reddiyar ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri S.S Dere, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that his juniors are going to be promoted and therefore, he prays for grant of interim relief. However, learned CPO submits that the reply is going to be filed today and some time to be given for hearing on the issue of grant of interim relief.

3. Matter is fixed on 25.8.2020 for hearing on the issue of interim relief. However, if at all the juniors to the applicant in the same cadre is promoted, the said order of promotion will be subject to the outcome of this O.A.

4. S.O to 25.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 290/2020**

Shri K.S Meher ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri K.R Jagdale, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2 Pursuant to our order dated 2.7.2020, we were informed by the learned C.P.O that the settlement could not be materialized. Learned C.P.O submits that the Officer Shri Rajkumar Vhatkar, Joint Commisisoner of Police, Navi Mumbai wants to file affidavit in reply because he did not use abusive language at the time of the incident. However from the tenor of the order it is interpreted that the Tribunal has given a confirmed opinion of the use of abusive language by the said officer.

3. We made it clear at this stage that no such confirmed view is expressed about use of abusive language by the Tribunal. The order was passed with intention to help the Police Officers to settle the matter amicably so that the time of the Police personnel should not be wasted in such trivial fights among themselves when their services are required for other better cause.

4. As the amicable settlement is not possible, we withdraw our direction dated 2.7.2020 given to the Commissioner of Police, and other statements in the said order about the amicable settlement.

5. Learned C.P.O is directed to file reply. Meanwhile preliminary enquiry to proceed. On instructions from the officer present in the court, applicant is directed to be present for the preliminary enquiry at A.C.P Office, Turbhe. Applicant is personally present in the Court. It is noted by him.

6. S.O to 27.8.2020

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 291/2020**

Shri S.R Sutar ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri R.M Kolge, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.
2. Issue notice returnable on 3.9.2020.
3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.
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 in view of this present COVID-19 Pandemic situation. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
5. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.
6. The service may be done by hand delivery/ speed post/courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week before returnable date or on the same date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
7. Learned C.P.O waives service of notice.
8. S.O to 3.9.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 292/2020**

Shri S.D Joshi ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri D.B Khaire, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. Learned C.P.O submits that pursuant to the order dated 2.7.2020 the applicant was considered for promotion to the post of Deputy Collector, Selection Grade. Once his order for the said post is issued, thereafter his case for higher post i.e. of Additional Collector will be considered.

3. Learned C.P.O seeks time.

4. S.O to 15.9.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 810/2018**

Shri T.L Savane ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri M.D Lonkar, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. This matter is fixed only for short purpose that is to verify from the Respondents whether gratuity, P.F and Pension amount is paid to the applicant or not as he is required to undergo heart surgery.

3. Learned C.P.O seeks time.

3. S.O to 4.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(P.N Dixit)**  
**Vice-Chairman (A)**

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 334/2020**

D.Y Dange ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri Indrajeet Kulkarni, learned advocate for the applicants and Smt K.S Gaikwad, learned P.O for the Respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant states that by order dated 28.1.2020 rejecting his prayer that his service is covered under the Pension scheme of Maharashtra Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1982 and the notification dated 31.10.2005 is not applicable to the present applicant as he has taken this reappointment after his service in Defence. Learned Counsel challenges the said order of 28.1.2020 as it is issued by the Desk Officer and according to Rule 7 of M.C.S (Pension) Rules, 1982, Desk Officer is not the competent authority.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that notice is served on the Department and affidavit of service is also filed by the applicant.

4. Learned P.O for the Respondents seeks time to file reply.

5. S.O to 3.9.2020.

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**



**30.07.2020**

**O.A 340/2020**

S.P Thombare ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Ms Avanti Inamdar, holding for Shri Rameshwar Gite, learned advocate for the applicant and Shri A.J Chougule, learned P.O for the Respondents.
2. The O.A pertains to the recovery of the amount after the retirement of Class-III employee working in P.W.D, Nasik. The Respondents have ordered the recovery of amount of Rs. 2,29,999/- from pension amount of the applicant.
3. Issue notice returnable on 8.9.2020.
4. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.
5. 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 in view of this present COVID-19 Pandemic situation. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
6. 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.
7. 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 one week before returnable date or on the same date. Applicant is directed to file affidavit of compliance and notice.
8. Learned C.P.O waives service of notice.
9. The Respondents to consider the judgment of this Tribunal and also of the Hon. Supreme Court on the point of recovery of amt from pension from Class-III & IV employees.
10. Learned P.O seeks time to file reply.
11. Till next date, Respondents are directed not to recover any amount from the pension of the applicant.
12. S.O to 8.9.2020.

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**

**30.07.2020**

**M.A 174/2020 in O.A 272/2020 with M.A 175/2020  
in O.A 273/2020 with M.A 176/2020 in O.A 274/2020**

Shri R.D Shirsath & Ors ... Applicants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri K.R Jagdale, holding for Shri Shriram Palshikar, learned advocate for the applicants and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.

2. Learned C.P.O files reply.

3. S.O to 13.8.2020.

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**30.07.2020**

**O.A 287/2020**

Dr P.N Kakade ... Applicant  
Vs.  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ... Respondents

1. Heard Shri N.Y Ukey, learned advocate for the applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned C.P.O for the Respondents.
2. Applicant challenges the order dated 18.5.2020 regarding computation of the salary of the applicant by revised rate and to recover the surplus amount. The applicant has joined the service on 17.7.1993. He retired on 30.6.2020 and he started getting higher pay scale on completion of 12 years of service he was given the benefit of 12 years from 2005.
3. This Tribunal has passed detailed order on 20.6.2020. Pursuant to the said order, Respondents is supposed to file affidavit in reply.
4. Learned C.P.O seeks time.
5. S.O to 8.9.2020. Earlier protection granted against recovery to continue.

Sd/-  
**(Mridula R. Bhatkar, J.)**  
**Chairperson**

Akn

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.229 OF 2019**

**D.B. Marale**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Applicant in person is present. Heard Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. This O.A. has been finally heard on 28.06.2020 and adjourned today for filing affidavit of the Applicant along with leaving certificate of school.
3. Today, accordingly, the Applicant has filed affidavit along with annexures and the same is taken on record.
4. Closed for orders. Adjourned to 06.08.2020 for orders.

**Sd/-**

**(A.P. Kurhekar)**

**Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.266 OF 2017**

**B.P. Shinde**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. This is the matter which was part heard before lockdown and thereafter it could not be taken up due to COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown.
3. Today, the matter is adjourned finally and closed for judgment.

**Sd/-**

**(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.309 OF 2019**

**Dr. S.V. Patil**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, learned Advocate holding for Shri V.P. Potbhare, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. Today learned P.O. has filed affidavit on behalf of Respondent No.4 to the amended pleadings in O.A. It is taken on record.
3. Learned Advocate Shri R.M. Kolge submits that learned Advocate Shri V.P. Potbhare is unable to attend the matter due to lockdown and requested that the matter be adjourned to September, 2020.
4. Adjourned to 03.09.2020.

**Sd/-**

**(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.337 OF 2018**

**S.G. Jagade**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Applicant and learned Advocate for the Applicant are absent. Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents is present.

2. On last date also Applicant and his Advocate were absent and the matter was adjourned as to give them one more opportunity. However, today also Applicant and his Advocate are absent. It seems that due to COVID-19 pandemic situation and lockdown Applicant who is resident of Pune is unable to attend the matter.

3. In view of above, the matter is adjourned in the month of September 2020 giving one more opportunity to the Applicant.

4. Adjourned to 03.09.2020.

**Sd/-  
(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.136 OF 2020**

**H.V. Bhat**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Today, learned Advocate for the Applicant has filed affidavit in rejoinder. It is taken on record.

3. Applicant is presently working as Assistant Commissioner of Police, District Caste Verification Committee, Solapur, since, 30.09.2019. Thereafter he made representation for transfer at Pune on family difficulties stating that he is due to retire at the end of April 20-21. Commissioner of Police also recommended his transfer. However, no orders are passed by the Respondents. Ultimately, the Applicant has filed the present O.A.

4. Today, learned P.O. submits that he will take instructions from the Respondents about the Applicant's pending representation and seeks a week's time.

5. Adjourned to 06.08.2020. Hamdast granted.

**Sd/-  
(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk



**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.580 OF 2019**

**H.V. Bhat  
Versus**

**...Applicant**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned P.O. holding for Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. The matter is taken on today's board by the applicant by circulation for hearing. The matter is part heard but the arguments could not be completed due to COVID-19 pandemic situation and lockdown.
3. In view of the above, matter will be heard on 06.08.2020.

**Sd/-  
(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.293 OF 2019**

**D.R. Dhumal  
Versus**

**...Applicant**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned P.O. holding for Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. This O.A. was not on board for quite some time due to COVID-19 pandemic situation and lockdown, therefore, it is taken on board by the Applicant by circulation. Since, the Applicant is retired employee the matter needs to be decided at the stage of admission.
3. Adjourned to 06.08.2020.

**Sd/-  
(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.1008 OF 2019**

**N.V. Bhosale**

**...Applicant**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. This O.A. was not on board for quite some time due to COVID-19 pandemic situation and lockdown. Today, it is taken on board by circulation for hearing. Learned P.O. sought one week time for hearing as the matter has come for hearing today for the first time.

3. Adjourned to 06.08.2020.

**Sd/-  
(A.P. Kurhekar)  
Member(J)**

prk

**Date : 30.07.2020**

**O.A.NO.324 OF 2020**

**D.T. Pawar & Ors.**

**...Applicants**

**Versus**

**The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

1. Heard Shri S.S. Dere, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. This O.A. reveals very unusual situation where order passed by Respondent No.1 / Director General of Police is defied by Respondent No.2 / Commissioner of Police, Mumbai and therefore the Applicants were compelled to approach this Tribunal.

3. Applicants are seeking implementation of the transfer / modification orders dated 27.02.2019, 07.09.2019, 29.05.2019 and 14.06.2019 as they are not relieved by Respondent No.2.

4. In view of the above, on last date the directions were given to Respondent No.1, Director General of Police, Mumbai to explain the situation as to how the orders are not implemented by his subordinate official and to know whether the orders passed by him are still valid.

5. Today, learned P.O. instead of filing affidavit tendered the order dated 29.06.2020 issued by the Additional Director General of Police with the approval of Director General of Police, whereby directions are given to implement the orders issued by the Director General of Police in respect of 34 PSI whereby postings were modified. The letter is taken on record and marked by letter 'X'.

6. In view of the above, learned P.O. made statement that the matter be disposed of by giving suitable time to relieve the Applicant.

7. In view of above, O.A. is disposed of with directions to Respondents to relieve the Applicant within two weeks from today.

8. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

**(A.P. Kurhekar)**  
**Member(J)**

prk