IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

MISC. APPLICATION NO.340 OF 2016 IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.963 OF 2016 WITH MISC. APPLICATION NO.342 OF 2016 IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.966 OF 2016

MISC. APPLICATION NO.340 OF 2016 IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.963 OF 2016

1. The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

)...Applicants (Ori. Resp.No.1 & 2)

Versus

Shri Iresh G. Chappalwar.

)....Respondent (Ori. Applicant)

WITH

MISC. APPLICATION NO.342 OF 2016 IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.966 OF 2016

1. The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

)...Applicants (Ori. Resp.No.1 & 2)

Versus

1. Shri Hemant W. Salvi & Ors.

)...Respondents (Ori. Applicants)

Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, Chief Presenting Officer for Applicants (Ori. Respondents)

Ms. S.P. Manchekar, Advocate for Respondent (Ori. Applicant) in MA 340/16 and for Intervenor in MA 342/16

Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, Advocate for MA 342/16

P.C. : RAJIV AGARWAL (VICE-CHAIRMAN) R.B. MALIK (MEMBER-JUDICIAL)

DATE : 09.11.2016

PER : R.B. MALIK (MEMBER-JUDICIAL)

ORDER

1. These two Misc. Applications are presented by the State (Ori. Respondents) in disposed of OAs seeking extension of time to comply with our order therein by six months from 31.8.2016. A common order disposes them off.

2. We have perused the record and proceedings and heard Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Ori. Respondents), Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Applicant) and Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for Respondents (Ori. Applicants in MA 342/2016.

By our order dated 25.2.2016 in disposed of OAs, 3. the OAs were allowed to be withdrawn with directions that if the original Applicants made applications for grant of deemed date of promotion within one week from that day, the present Applicants should decide the same as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of the representations and communicate the decision thereon to the Applicants. It is common ground that within time, the representations were made by the original Applicants but somehow or the other, the present Applicants being the original Respondents could not keep the time limit. They have put on record a chart of what they did from date to date. A very detailed narration thereof may in fact be out of place. The present Applicants made another identical applications for condonation of delay in bringing these applications which were allowed.

4. We have to adjust the rival interests so as to ensure that the fruits of our order are not postponed indefinitely so as to become practically meaningless as far as the Applicants are concerned and at the same time, regard being had to the fact that steps have been taken to make sure that our order was complied with to grant some extension of time. We are of the opinion that this is not a matter where the present Applicants

have simply slept over the matter. We, however, make it clear that in the context of the facts, we are not so disposed as to grant six months' extension and grant of time upto 31st December, 2016 will be sufficient. The present Applicants must make sure that they fully comply with our orders within this extended time limit.

5. Some submissions were made with regard to what should be the direction given just in case the time limit was not kept. However, we do not propose to go into the academics of the matter because we mandate that the time limit as extended by us must be adhered to. The failure to do so might be pregnant with the consequences which may not exactly be pleasant.

6. For the foregoing, time to comply is hereby extended upto 31st December, 2016 as final extension. The MAs are disposed of in these terms with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) Member-J 09.11.2016 Sd/-

(Rajiv Agarwal) Vice-Chairman 09.11.2016

Mumbai Date : 09.11.2016 Dictation taken by : S.K. Wamanse. E:\SANJAY WAMANSE\JUDGMENTS\2016\11 November, 2016\M.A.340.16 in OA 963.12 & Anr.w.11.2016.doc