

THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

CONTEMPT APPLICATION NO.98 OF 2015
IN
MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO.343 OF 2015
IN
REVIEW APPLICATION NO.18 OF 2015
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1080 OF 2014

DISTRICT : MUMBAI

Chief Presenting Officer,)
 Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,)
 Mumbai Bench, Mumbai) .. Applicant

IN

Shri Anway Maruti Ambetkar,)
 B/10, Sankheshwar Madhuban,)
 Boarding Road,)
 Maal Naka, Ratnagiri 415 612.)
....Respondent (Org. Applicant)

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra,)
 Through the Secretary,)
 Revenue & Forests Department,)
 Mantralaya,)
 Mumbai.)
...Respondent (Org. Respondent No.1)

Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Applicant as well as Respondent (Org. Respondent No.1).

None appeared for Respondent (Org. Applicant).

CORAM : JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN
SHRI RAJIV AGARWAL, VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESERVED ON : 28.03.2016.

PRONOUNCED ON : 31-03.2016.

PER : JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN

J U D G M E N T

1. Heard Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Applicant as well as Respondent (Org. Respondent No.1). None appeared for Respondent (Org. Applicant).
2. Notice of Tribunal was not sent to the Applicant, though learned P.O. was permitted to serve the Applicant.
3. Perused the imputations contained in the application for review which according to the learned C.P.O. are contemptuous.
4. The averments contained in Review Application which are purportedly potent with contemptuous language / wording, shows or proves total lack of discretion on the part of applicant and his state of mind of departing from balanced and ideal behaviour.
5. The averments contained in the pleadings in so far those are not made public, need not be regarded as expression as a product of Contempt.
6. Hence, it is not necessary to proceed against the Respondent for Contempt.
7. Proceedings are dropped.

Sd/-
(RAJIV AGARWAL)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Sd/-
(A.H. JOSHI, J)
CHAIRMAN

prk