C.P.No.32/2020 in O.A.No.222/2018 (D.B.)

<u>Coram</u> : Shri A.D.Karanjkar, Member (J) <u>Dated</u> : 20/11/2020.

Heard Shri A.R.Kalele, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the State.

2. Issue Notice to the respondents returnable in **four weeks** under Rule 8 of the MAT (Contempt of Courts) Rules, 1996 as to why they should not be proceeded for committing contempt of this Tribunal's order and as to why they shall not be punished under the Contempt of Court Act.

3. Shri M.I.Khan, the learned P.O. waives notice for respondent No. 1. Hamdast granted.

4. S.O. four weeks.

Member (J)

Date:-20/11/2020. aps.

C.P.No.39/2020 in O.A.No.549/2016 (D.B.)

<u>Coram</u> : Shri A.D.Karanjkar, Member (J) <u>Dated</u> : 20/11/2020.

Heard Shri R.M.Fating, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the State.

2. Issue Notice to the respondents returnable in **four weeks** under Rule 8 of the MAT (Contempt of Courts) Rules, 1996 as to why they should not be proceeded for committing contempt of this Tribunal's order and as to why they shall not be punished under the Contempt of Court Act.

3. Shri M.I.Khan, the learned P.O. waives notice for respondent No. 1. Hamdast granted.

4. S.O. four weeks.

Member (J)

Date:-20/11/2020. aps.

O.A.Nos.592&630/2019 (S.B.)

<u>Coram</u>:Shri A.D.Karanjkar, Member (J) <u>Dated</u> :20/11/2020.

Heard Shri Prateek Sharma holding for Shri M.M.Sudame, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the respondents.

2. The Id. P.O. requested time to seek instructions, **S.O. two weeks.**

Member (J)

Date:-20/11/2020. aps.

O.A.No.1080/2019 (S.B.)

<u>Coram</u>:Shri A.D.Karanjkar, Member (J) <u>Dated</u> :20/11/2020.

Heard Shri S.N.Nandeshwar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the respondents.

2. I have perused the letter dated 03.01.2020 written by R.D.C., Amravati to the Collector, Parbhani. The R.D.C., Amravati requested the Collector, Parbhani to give information whether it was possible to accommodate the applicant in Parbhani District. In response to this letter R.D.C., Parbhani informed the Collector, Amravati that post of Talathi of category Hk-t-M- was not vacant and, therefore, it was not possible to accommodate the applicant in Parbhani District.

3. The ld. counsel for the applicant has placed reliance on the M.A.T., Mumbai Judgment in **O.A. No. 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366/2019 in G.P.Bhagat & Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors. delivered on 12.06.2019.** It is submitted that similar situation was examined and direction was given to the respondent to decide the application and request of the applicants as per G.R. dated 15.05.2019. In view of this I think, it suitable to direct the Respondent no. 1 to consider case of the applicant and take suitable decision as per Law. The Respondent no. 2 is directed to forward all the papers to the Respondent no. 1 for taking suitable action. **The Respondent no. 1 shall comply this**

order within two months after receiving the papers from the Respondent no. 2.

4. With the above directions, **O.A. stands** disposed of with no order as to costs.

Date:-20/11/2020. aps. Member (J)