

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI**

**CONTEMPT APPLICATION NO.21 OF 2020 WITH
CONTEMPT APPLICATION NO.54 OF 2020 WITH
MISC APPLICATION NO.138 OF 2020 WITH
MISC APPLICATION NO.304 OF 2020**

**IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.953 OF 2016**

Shri Sachin Shashikant Kamble,)
Age : 34 years, Occ – Agriculture Servant,)
R/at. Post Junnar, Near Panchayat,)
Samittee, Junnar, Pune.) **...Applicant**

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,)
Through the Secretary,)
Animal Husbandry, Dairy & Fisheries)
Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai.)
2. The Commissioner of Agriculture (MS))
Near Pune Station, Pune 1.)
3. The Divisional Agriculture Joint Director)
Krushi Bhavan, Near Sakhar Sankul,)
Shivaji Nagar, Pune 05.)
4. The District Superintendent Agriculture)
Officer, Krushi Bhavan,)
Near Sakhar Sankul, Shivaji Nagar,)
Pune 05.)
5. Sub Divisional Agriculture Officer,)
Rajguru Nagar, Tal-Khed, Dist. Pune)

- | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|-----------------------|
| 6. | The Taluka Agriculture Officer, New Administrative Building Shirur Tal- Shirur, Dist. Pune. |))) | |
| 7. | The Circle Agriculture Officer, Circle Pabal, Tal- Shirur, Dist. Pune |)) | |
| 8. | The Agriculture Officer, District Central Fruit Nursery, Rajgurunagar, Dist. Pune. |))) | |
| 9. | Chief Presenting Officer, M.A.T.. Mumbai |)) | ...Respondents |

Shri S.S. Kamble, learned Applicant in Person.

Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

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

DATE : 19.03.2021.

PER : Smt. Justice Mridula R. Bhatkar, (Chairperson).

JUDGMENT

1. Heard Shri S.S. Kamble, Applicant in Person and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Pursuant to order dated 28.01.2021 the Applicant was asked to furnish the pen-drive consisting of details of forty-one documents and also the documents of which details are mentioned in other twelve Applications given by him to the Respondents.

3. The Applicant in person, Shri S.S. Kamble today submits that he could not produce the pen-drive because the details of the documents which he has asked for, could not be taken on pen-drive. The typists to whom he approached gave negative excuses and therefore he requested the Tribunal to intervene.

4. The lists of the documents are not legible. We have requested the Applicant to furnish typed copy giving details of the documents which he want, so that we can order the Respondents to furnish those documents, as nobody is in position to read and understand the details of this documents. The Applicant in person submits that the concerned typists to whom he requested to prepare the pen-drive told that their typewriter is having corona. He said that Respondents are adamant to furnish the details of the documents. He further submits that earlier the Respondents have furnished him the copies of the documents then why now the Respondents are facing any problem in furnishing the documents. Applicant submits that therefore it is apparent that Respondent did not want to furnish documents to him, which is not correct. He submits that he has mentioned the names of the officers, hence on that basis documents as demanded by him are to be furnished. He further submits that in the application of 2018 he has mentioned all the documents and they were furnished to him. Therefore the reason given by the Respondents that they are unable to understand the details of the documents is baseless. The Applicant in person therefore submits that the Respondents have their adamant attitude and are liable to pay cost to the Applicant. The Applicant prays that Respondents to be directed to furnish all the documents in all the Applications & if not given the Respondents

should be fined. Specific time is to be given to the Respondents to furnish the documents.

7. All the submissions made by the Applicant in person are taken on record, in his presence. The Respondents have earlier informed that they have furnished certain documents to the Applicant and Applicant has also accepted that some documents which were furnished to him. However he has demanded more documents and he has given many applications to that effect as mentioned in para 3 of earlier order dated 28.01.2021, there are twelve applications. However, now he corrected that not twelve applications, but eight applications are made by him.

8. The hand written matter of all these Applications is not legible, and therefore, the Respondents rightly expressed inability to meet the demand made by the Applicant. The reason given by the Applicant that the typist to whom he has approached could not give the data consisting the details of the documents, and therefore, he could not take it on pen-drive and hence pen-drive could not be supplied is difficult to accept. Moreover, the reason of typewriters suffering from corona is weird.

9. We are also unable to understand which documents Applicant really wants.

10. We tried to find out via-media by asking him to furnish the details on pen-drive with a view to help the Applicant so that as per the details furnished, necessary directions can be given to the Respondents. The Respondents can verify the details of the available documents and if

available documents can be furnished, if not available accordingly reply can be given by the Respondents.

11. However we are clueless and therefore we dismiss all these Applications.

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

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

Place: Mumbai
Date: 19.03.2021
Dictation taken by: N.M. Naik.