

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/9244/2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date :

- 4 JUL 2016

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 197 OF 2016.
(Sub :- Compulsory Leave)

1. Shri Rajaram S. Patil,
R/at. RFO Quarters, Forest Camp, A/P. Janvali, Tal. Kankavli,
Dist. Sindhudurg.

....**APPLICANT/S.**

VERSUS

- 1 The Govt. of Maharashtra, Through Principal Secretary, Revenue and Forest Dept., Mantralaya, Mumbai-32. 2 Chief Conservator of Forest (T), Kolhapur, Near Post Office, Tarabai Park, Kolhapur-416 003.
- 3 Deputy Conservator of Forest, Forest Division, Sawantwadi, Dist. Sindhudurg.

...**RESPONDENT/S**

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 28th day of **June, 2016** has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Shri M.D. Lonkar, Advocate for the Applicant.
Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, P.O. for the Respondents.

CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI R.B. MALIK, MEMBER (J).**

DATE : **28.06.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Amal
4/7/2016
**Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.**

Tribunal's orders

O.A.197/2016


Shri R.S. Patil ... Applicant
Vs.
The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents

Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

This OA can be finally disposed of here and now in view of the submissions made by both the sides.


To the extent, necessary facts are to be stated, ~~The~~ Applicant made to proceed on compulsory leave. That action was questioned by the Applicant in this OA. By an elaborate 8 page interim order made by me on 25th February, 2016, that order came to be stayed. ~~The~~ fall out whereof was that the Applicant continued to be serving on the same post.

However, later on, the Applicant came to be transferred in, "usual manner". That transfer has since been challenged by the Applicant by way of OA 314/2016 which is also on the Board of this Bench. I agree with the submissions at the Bar that the very fact that the Applicant came to be transferred must proceed on the basis that the order of compulsory leave was in any case recalled and in view of the transfer even though that aspect of the matter remains pending in that other OA, nothing survives in this OA now and in view of that, this OA stands disposed of as infructuous with no order as to costs.


 (R.B. Malik)
 Member (J)
 28.06.2016

(skw)

TRUE COPY


 4/7/2016
 Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer
 Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
 Mumbai