

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**NAGPUR BENCH NAGPUR**  
**REVIEW APPLICATION No.05 of 2018**  
**IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 117 of 2017 (SB)**

Shri Prabhakar Ramchandra Kharbade,  
Aged about 79 years, Occ. Retired, R/o Plot No.51-A,  
Kalyaneshwar Nagar, Near Shiv Mandir, Manewada-Besa Road,  
Nagpur-27.

**Applicant.**

**Versus**

- 1) State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Finance Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 2) Superintendent of Police,  
Railways, Ajni, Nagpur.
- 3) Accountant General (A&E)-II,  
Maharashtra Civil Lines,  
Nagpur-01.
- 4) Senior Treasury Officer,  
O/o District Treasury,  
Civil Lines, Nagpur-01.

**Respondents**

---

**Shri A.K. Waghmare, Advocate for the applicant.**

**Shri M.I. Khan, learned P.O. for respondents.**

---

**Coram :- Hon'ble Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J).**

---

## JUDGMENT

**(Delivered on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October,2018)**

Heard Shri A.K. Waghmare, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. The applicant has filed this Review Petition against the Judgment delivered in O.A.No.117/2017 by this Tribunal on 21/03/2018. The applicant's O.A. for following reliefs was dismissed :-

*“ i) Declare that the column no.3 of the ready reckoner of the G.R. dated 05/05/2009 (page no.36 of Annex-5) is not correctly printed as per the G.R. dated 05/05/2009 and hence the third column of the ready reckoner attached to the said G.R. dated 05/05/2009 be declared as null and void and not binding on the applicant.*

*ii) Further this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to direct the respondent and more particularly respondent nos. 3 and 4 to re-fix the basic pension as on 01/08/2004 @ Rs.3534/- and also to re-fix the basic pension as on 01/01/2006 @ Rs.7987/- as well as consolidated pension as on 01/01/2006 @ Rs.15,176/-.*

*iii) Further be pleased to grant difference of arrears from 01/08/2004 till December,2015 to the tune of Rs.18,12,788/- as per annexure no.A-3 (page nos.28-30) of the Original Application along with 18% interest.”*

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the basic case of the applicant was not considered in a proper perspective and / or in advertently the grounds raised by the applicant in para nos. 6.5 to 6.9 were ignored. It is further stated that in para nos. 7 and 8 of the Judgment the relevant paragraphs quoted are not relevant and the Judgment cited in para no.9 of the Hon'ble Apex Court is not applicable to the present set of facts.

4. Perusal of the Judgment delivered by this Tribunal shows that in para no.8 of the Judgment the defence taken by the respondent authorities was considered, in para no.6 the applicant's case was also considered. In para no.9 the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court was referred since it was cited by the respondent no.1. The reasons have been given in para no.10 and the Tribunal was of the view that the respondent authorities have considered various aspects and various circulars issued by the Government from time to time and properly fixed the pension of the applicant. There seems to be no inadvertent or typographical mistakes so as to review the Judgment. If the applicant is aggrieved by the order delivered by this Tribunal, he has every right to file appeal to the Hon'ble Apex Court or to file Writ Petition as the case may be. No error apparent seems to have appeared

so as to review the Judgment. I, therefore, do not find any merits in the Review Application. Hence, the following order :-

**ORDER**

The Review Application No.05 of 2018 in O.A.No.117/2017 stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

**Dated :- 05/10/2018.**

**(J.D. Kulkarni)  
Vice-Chairman (J).**

dnk.