

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH**

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/2679/2016  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,  
Free Press Journal Marg,  
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date :

26 JUL 2016

**C.A. No. 53/2016 IN O.A. No. 279/2015.**  
**(Sub :- Appointment)**

- 1 Shri Amol A. Suryawanshi,  
R/o. Kole-Kalyan Police Line, Bldg. No.5, R.No. 204, Santacruz(E), Mumbai.  
....**APPLICANT/S.**

**VERSUS**

- 1 Smt. Mausami Barde, The Sub  
Divisional Officer, Bhor, Sub  
Division Bhor, Tal.Bhor, Dist. Thane
- 2 Shri Saurabh Rao, The District  
Collector, Pune, Having Office at  
Pune.
- 3 Shri Mukesh Khullar, The State of  
Maharashtra, Through Principal  
Secretary, G.A.D., Having Office at  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 4 Shri Swadhin Kshatriya, The Chief  
Secretary, State of Maharashtra,  
Having Office at Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.

...**RESPONDENT/S**

Copy to : The C.P.O. M.A.T., Mumbai.

*The applicant/s above named has filed an application as per copy already served on you, praying for reliefs as mentioned therein. The Tribunal on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of **July, 2016** has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, Advocate for the Applicant.  
Ms. N.G. Gohad, P.O. for the Respondents.

CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI R.B. MALIK, MEMBER (J).**

DATE : **25.07.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

*Amal*  
*26/7/2016*  
**Research Officer,**  
**Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,**  
**Mumbai.**

(8)

(Spl. MAT-F-2 E.

**TRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI**

of 20

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

versus

e State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

Forum,  
of  
ers

Tribunal's orders  
**C.A.53/2016 in O.A.279/2015**

**Shri A.A. Suryawanshi ... Applicant**  
**Vs.**  
**The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents**

Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

Shri Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the order of appointment dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2016 has been issued to the Applicant. However, his grievance is with regard to the fact that the order should become effective from 1<sup>st</sup> June, 2016 and not 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2016 because the time limit prescribed by the order of the OA would bear him out. In my view, relying on the doctrine of substantive compliance, nothing survives in the C.A. and the same is hereby disposed of making it clear, however, that it is being disposed of after taking note of the fact that the order of appointment is in fact being issued to the Applicant and no interference therewith shall be made by the Respondents.

malik  
5)

2  
2

used.

8

sd/-  
[Redacted Signature]

(R.B. Malik) 25.7.16  
Member (J)  
25.07.2016

(skw)

TRUE COPY

malik  
26/7/2016

Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Mumbai.

[P.T.O.]