

Thaker

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH**

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/4297 /2016  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,  
Free Press Journal Marg,  
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date :

25 NOV 2016

**M.A. No. 435/2016 IN O.A. No. 267/2013.**

**(Sub :- Deemed Date of Promotion)**

- 1 The State of Maharashtra, Through the Secretary, Home Dept., Mantralaya, Mumbai. (Ori. Resp. 1)      2 The Commissioner, State Excise, Mumbai, Old Custom House, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, S.B.S.Rd., Fort Mumbai-23 (Ori. Resp. 2)

**....APPLICANT/S.(Ori. Resp. No. 1 & 2)**

**VERSUS**

- 1 Mr. Ravindra R. Avtade,  
R/at. 40, Samartha Krupa, Dhanalaxmi Colony, Shahupuri, Satara.

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

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 **22<sup>nd</sup>** day of **November, 2016** has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE : Shri K.B. Bhise, P.O. For the Applicants (Ori. Resp.)  
Shri. K.R. Jagdale, Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Appli.)  
CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI R.B.MALIK, MEMBER(J).**  
DATE : **22.11.2016.**  
ORDER : Heard Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Ori. Respondents) and Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Applicant).

This is an MA moved by the original Respondents seeking extension of time by three months to comply with my order dated 25.7.2016 which is self-speaking. The compliance ought to have been made by 24.10.2016 because three months time was given. This MA was moved on 27.10.2016 when in fact, the time limit had already expired. The learned PO invites reference to the Chart whereunder according to the present Applicants, they took various steps to comply with my order, but the two entries themselves are their undoing. On their own showing, they received the copy of my order of 26.7.2016 and did nothing till 3.9.2016. Once the order of the Court is there for compliance and the same is not challenged, then there has to be strong reason to exceed the time limit. It is a matter of a retired employee, and therefore, expeditious compliance was the need of the hour though I still granted three months time right at the beginning in disposing of the OA. I find no merit herein and the MA for extension of time is accordingly dismissed with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

**(R.B. Malik)**  
**Member (J)**

*Handwritten signature*  
25/11/2016

**Research Officer,**  
**Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,**  
**Mumbai.**