

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 722 OF 2016

DISTRICT: - PARBHANI.

Shri Kamlakar S/o. Sonpanrao Hinge
Age - 41 years, Occu: Agriculture,
R/o. Dighol, Tq. Gangakhed
District- Parbhani.

.. APPLICANT.

V E R S U S

- 1) The State of Maharashtra
Through it's Secretary,
Employment and Self Employment
Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-400 032.
- 2) The District Collector
Collector Office, Parbhani.
- 3) The District Collector
Collector Office, Beed.
- 4) The Tahsildar,
Tahsil Office at Sonpeth,
Dist. Parbhani.

(Copies to be served on P.O.
in M.A.T. at Aurangabad)

.. RESPONDENTS

APPEARANCE : Shri V.B. Kale, learned Advocate
for the applicant.

: Shri V.R. Bhumkar – learned
Presenting Officer for the resps.

**CORAM : JUSTICE M.T. JOSHI, VICE CHAIRMAN
AND
: SHRI ATUL RAJ CHADHA, MEMBER (A)**

DATE : 13TH JUNE, 2018.

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard Shri V.B. Kale, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri V.R. Bhumkar – learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.
2. The present applicant is seeking appointment to the post of Talathi from the post reserved for horizontal reservation of part time Government employee. The relevant Government Resolution provide for such a reservation, in case the claimant has completed 3 years' service as part time employee.
3. The copy of the certificate of the present applicant to that effect is at page No. 15 of the O.A., and the photo copy of the same has been filed by the State. During the verification however its genuineness is found to be suspicious. As per the affidavit in reply of the respondent Government Institute of Forensic Science, Aurangabad found that the signature of the Tahsildar over the original certificate differs from his usual signature and, therefore, the issue remained pending.

4. During the pendency of the present Original Application, on 22.8.2017 this Tribunal directed respondent Nos. 2, the District Collector to verify the supporting record independently. According to the respondent No. 2, the record was verified and the report of the same is filed on record at Annexure 'RJ-1', page-54. It would show that when the payment register of the period was examined, it was found that the applicant worked only for 33 months. The details of the same are given in the said report.

5. Considering all these facts on record independent contemporary document i.e. the payment register does not support the claim of the present applicant that he worked for a period of 36 months as provided by the Government Resolution. Therefore, no case is made out for granting relief. In the circumstances, the present O.A. stands dismissed without any order as to costs.

MEMBER (A)

VICE CHAIRMAN

PLACE : AURANGABAD.

DATE : 13TH JUNE, 2018.

O.A.NO.664-2013(DB)-HDD-2018-Promotion