

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 151 OF 2016

DISTRICT: BEED

Dr. Sudhakar S/o Madhavrao Surwase,
Age: 59 years, Occu. : Pensioner,
R/o "Mauli", Mahesh Nagar, Near Pawan Hotel,
Channi, Ambajogai, Dist. Beed.

.. **APPLICANT**

V E R S U S

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Finance Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
- 2) The Secretary,
Animal Husbandry Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
- 3) The Regional Jt. Commissioner of
Animal Husbandry, Region Latur,
Latur.
- 4) The Regional Jt. Commissioner of
Animal Husbandry,
Region Aurangabad.

.. **RESPONDENTS**

APPEARANCE : Shri P.R. Tandale, learned Advocate for the
Applicant.

: Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned Presenting
Officer for the Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI B.P. PATIL, MEMBER (J)

ORAL ORDER**(Delivered on this 2nd day of March, 2017.)**

1. Heard Shri P.R. Tandale, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned Presenting Officer for respondents.

2. The applicant was serving as a Live Stock Development Officer in Animal Husbandry Department, State of Maharashtra. He retired on 31.07.2014 on attaining age of superannuation. He received the benefit of first time bound promotion w.e.f. 1.8.2001 and thereafter, he put in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 plus Grade Pay of Rs. 5700/-. According to the applicant, he completed 12 years service in the year 2013, but the benefit of second time bound promotion was not granted to the applicant in view of the G.Rs. dated 01.04.2010 and 5.7.2010.

3. The learned Advocate for the applicant submitted that the applicant made representation to the concerned authorities on 19.09.2013 (paper book page no. 24) but it was not decided by the respondents.

4. The learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that this Tribunal has decided the O.A. No. 229/2015 and directed the respondents to extend the benefit of revised in service

Assured Progress Scheme on the basis of above referred G.Rs. He has submitted that as the respondents have not decided the representation of the applicant, it is proper to direct the respondents to decide the representation within stipulated time.

5. The learned P.O. submits that the decision given by this Tribunal in O.A. No. 229/2015 as well as in O.A. No. 16/2015 are on different facts and therefore, are not attracted in this case.

6. I am going through the papers it reveals that the representation made by the applicant to the respondents on 19.09.2013 is still pending. The concerned authority has not taken decision thereof. Therefore, it would just and proper to direct the respondents to decide the representation made by the applicant at the earliest.

7. In view thereof, the respondents are directed to decide the representation dated 19.09.2013 made by the applicant within three months from the date of this order on merit. Accordingly, the O.A. stands disposed of with no order as to costs.

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)