

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI****MISC. APPLICATION NO.111 OF 2017**  
**IN**  
**ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.15 of 2016****District : NASHIK**

1. The Education Commissioner (M.S.) )  
Pune, balbharati Campus, Senapati )  
Bapat Marg, Pune – 4. )
2. The Municipal Commissioner, )  
Mumbai Municipal Corporation, Mumbai, )
3. The State of Maharashtra, through the )  
Principal Secretary, School Education )  
Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai 32. )...Applicants (Ori.Resp.)

Versus

Shri Arun J. Thakare. )  
R/s. at Padmaj, Sharda C.H.S. Old Naka )  
Gangapur Road, Nashik – 13. )..Respondent (Ori.Appli.)

Ms N.G. Gohad, Presenting Officer for Applicants (Ori. Respondents)

Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, Advocate for Respondent (Ori. Applicant)

CORAM : SHRI R.B. MALIK (MEMBER-JUDICIAL)

DATE : 15.03.2017

**ORDER**

1. This is an application for extension of time to comply with the directions in the disposed of O.A. No.15/2016. The present Applicants are original Respondents and the present Respondent is the original Applicant. By the order of 05.01.2017, the present Applicants were directed to pay to the original Applicant the interest as therein mentioned within six weeks from that day which period expired on 16.02.2017 and this application came to be presented on 09.03.2017 which was beyond time limit fixed in the O.A.

2. No reply is filed and none is required. I have heard Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned P.O. for the present Applicants and Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the present Respondent.

3. The perusal of the application would show that the State is not quite clear on what it proposes to do. The Commissioner of Education was on election duty in the State of Punjab. That is one plea raised then there is some kind of a mixed plea of time to consider challenge to the order in the O.A. and also that it has to be complied with. The crux of the matter is that there was by the very nature of things nothing to prevent the compliance being made even if the challenge was contemplated. The original Applicant retired about nine years ago and he is still fighting for his dues. Any further indulgence by this Tribunal will be impermissible.

4. Misc. Application is accordingly rejected with no order as to costs.

Sd/-  
(R.B. Malik)  
Member (J)  
15.03.2017