

Thakur

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/ 2036 /2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date :

18 JUN 2016

M.A. No. 223/2016 IN O.A. No. 227/2016.
(Sub :-Promotion along with Deemed Date)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 State of Maharashtra, Through
Chief Secretary, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32. | 2 The Principal Secretary, Revenue &
Forest Dept., Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32. |
| 3 Additional Controller of Stamps,
Mumbai, Town Hall, Fort, Mumbai-1 | 4 Inspector General of Registration &
Stamps Controller, M.S., Opp.
Council Hall, Pune-01. |

....**APPLICANT/S. (Ori. Resp.)**

VERSUS

1. Shri Mahesh M. Patankar,
R/at. 87/Sarayu, Narayana Guru CHS Ltd., P.L. Lokhande Road,
Chembur (w), Mumbai-80.

...**RESPONDENT/S (Ori. Appl.)**

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 16th day of June, 2016 has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE : Shri A.J. Chougule, P.O. for the Applicants (Ori. Resp.).
Shri. M.D. Lonkar, Advocate holding for Smt. P. Mahajan,
Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Appli.).

CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI RAJIV AGARWAL, VICE-CHAIRMAN.**
HON'BLE SHRI R.B. MALIK, MEMBER (J).

DATE : **16.06.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Malik
18/6/2016
Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.

Tribunal's orders
MA No.223/16 in OA No.227/16




Heard Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Applicants-original Respondents and Shri M.D. Lonkar, learned Advocate holding for Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Respondent-original Applicant.



2. This is an application seeking extension of time to comply with the order made by this bench on 4.5.2016. The compliance was to be made within four weeks of that order which period expired on 1.6.2016, the time was not one month but four weeks.

3. We have decided against protracting the matter needlessly and, therefore, we did not consider it necessary to ask for reply from respondent-original applicant because this matter did not deserve that consideration.

4. The applicant is not just making sad reading but it smacks of clear defiance of our order. In good measure the ground expressly rejected in our final order on the OA has again been made a fact facet of this MA. The Tribunal in some ways in such matters keeps aside the rule of functus officio. The whole thing is very clear. That can be done provided the applicant of such MAs makes out its conduct as meritorious. We are very clearly of the view that this is not an attribute of this particular application. In fact this is a matter where we should not let the applicants hereof being the original respondents without having to pay cost.


5. The MA is, therefore, dismissed with costs quantified in a single set of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited in the office of this Tribunal within one week from today.

  
 (R.B. Malik) 16.6.16
 Member (J)
 16.6.2016

 
 (Rajiv Aggarwal)
 Vice-Chairman
 16.6.2016

(sgj)

TRUE COPY


 Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer
 Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal