

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 542 OF 2016

(SUBJECT : POLICE PATIL)

DISTRICT: AURANGABAD

Smt. Vaishali w/o Ashok Kathar,)
Age: 27 years, Occu. : Household,)
R/o. Amdabad, Tq. Kannad,)
Dist. Aurangabad.)

.. **APPLICANT**

V E R S U S

1) **The Divisional Commissioner,**)
Aurangabad Division,)
Aurangabad.)

2) **The Collector,**)
Collector Office, Aurangabad.)

3) **The Sub-Divisional Officer,**)
Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad.)

4) **Shri Dnyaneshwar s/o Vhikan**)
Salunke,)
R/o Amdabad, Tq. Kannad,)
District Aurangabad.)

.. **RESPONDENTS**

APPEARANCE : Shri Anant D. Gadekar, learned Advocate for
the Applicant.

: Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned Presenting Officer
for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

: Shri D.T. Devane, learned Advocate for
respondent No. 4

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

ORDER**(Delivered on this 30th day of November, 2017.)**

1. The applicant has challenged the order dated 13.06.2016 passed by the respondent No. 3; by which objection raised by him for selection of the respondent No. 4 for the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad has been rejected, and the order dated 27.06.2016 issued by the respondent No. 3; by which the respondent No. 4 has been appointed as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad.

2. The respondent No. 3 had issued advertisement No. 01/2016 dated 25.02.2016 inviting online applications from the eligible candidates for filling the posts of Police Patil of different villages situated in Kannad Taluka including village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad. As per the advertisement, the aspiring candidates must possess S.S.C. qualification and the age of aspiring candidate shall not be less than 25 years and shall not be more than 45 years as on 25.01.2016. He must be resident of same village. He should not be affiliated to any political party and he should not be Member of the Grampanchayat or private or semi Government society and he has to furnish affidavit on stamp paper of Rs. 100/- at the time of scrutiny of the documents before

oral interview. The applicant filled up an application online and after submitting application, she appeared for written examination along with respondent No. 4 and other eligible candidates. The respondent No. 3 published the mark-list of the candidates, who had appeared for the written examination. The respondent No. 4 secured 65 marks and stood first, while the applicant secured 60 marks and he stood second in merit. After publishing the merit list, the applicant made a representation dated 4.3.2015 to the respondent No. 3 stating that the respondent No. 4 is a sitting Member of the Grampanchayat and it is against the conditions mentioned in the advertisement and therefore, she prayed to cancel his candidature for the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad. It is her contention that wife of the respondent No. 4 is also sitting Member of the Grampanchayat. It is her contention that the respondent No. 4 was appointed as Vice President of School Management Committee and he is affiliated to political party of viz. Shiv Sena. He contested elections of Zilla Parishad in the year 2012 as a candidate of Shiv Sena. She has produced the necessary documents in that regard before the respondent No. 3 and requested him to disqualify the respondent No. 4, but the respondent No. 3 rejected her objection by order dated 13.06.2016 on the ground that the respondent No. 4 resigned as

the Member of Grampanchayat on 17.03.2016 and also from the post of Vice President of School Management Committee on 18.03.2016 and he had also resigned the Membership of Shiv Sena party on 21.02.2016. Thereafter, respondent No. 3 issued appointment order in favour of the respondent No. 4, as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad on 27.06.2016.

3. The applicant has challenged the selection and appointment of the respondent No. 4 as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad on the ground that the respondent No. 4 was affiliated to political party and he was sitting Member of Grampanchayat at the time of filing of his online application on the due date. It is her contention that the respondent No. 3 has not considered her objections with proper perspective and rejected her objection. Therefore, she has filed the present Original Application.

4. The respondent Nos. 2 and 4 have filed their separate affidavit in replies and resisted the contention of the applicant. They have admitted the fact that the applicant has filed objection with the respondent No. 3 challenging the eligibility and selection of respondent No. 4. The respondent No. 3 heard both parties on 9.5.2016, 24.05.2016, 31.05.2016 and 6.6.2016 and passed the

impugned order on 13.06.2016. It is their contention that the respondent No. 4 had resigned from the post of Member of Grampanchayat on 17.03.2016 and also resigned from the post of Vice Chairman of School Management Committee and filed the documents in that regard. It is their contention that the respondent No. 4 filed documents showing that he was not affiliated to any political party at the time of his appointment and therefore, the appointment order has been issued by the respondent No. 3 accordingly. It is their contention that the respondent No. 4 had not given false information. It their further contention that the respondent No. 4 secured highest marks i.e. 65 marks amongst the candidates appeared for oral interview, while the applicant secured 60 marks. Since the respondent No. 4 secured highest marks, he was declared as selected candidate and thereafter, he was appointed as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad by impugned order dated 27.06.2016. It is their contention that the respondent No. 3 has passed the order dated 13.06.2016 after hearing both the parties and, therefore, there is no illegality in the said order, as well as, appointment order dated 27.06.2016 issued by the respondent No. 3 in favour of respondent No. 4 as Police Patil. Therefore, they prayed to dismiss the present Original Application.

5. It is their further contention that the respondent No. 4 had verified the documents of respondent No. 4 and after verifying the documents and genuiness, the respondent No. 3 declared the respondent No. 4 as selected candidate. On these ground they have prayed to dismiss the present Original Application.

6. The respondent No. 4 resisted the contention of the applicant in his affidavit in reply on the ground that he is resident of village Amdabad and he appeared for the written examination and scored highest marks i.e. 65 marks and, therefore, he was declared as selected candidate. He has admitted the fact that he was elected as a Member of Grampanchayat of village Amdabad. But, he had not contested the election on behalf of any political party and on the symbol of any political party. He has submitted that he has submitted his resignation dated 17.03.2016 as a Member of Gram Panchayat Amdabad to the Sarpanch/Gram Sevak of Amdabad and it was accepted by the Gram Panchayat in its meeting dated 28.03.2016 and accordingly, Gram Sevak informed him vide communication dated 5.4.2016. He has admitted the fact that he was Vice President of School Management Committee, but he tendered his resignation of the said post on 17.03.2016 and it was accepted by the concerned authority. He has admitted the fact that he had contested the

election of Panchayat Samiti as a candidate of Shiv Sena party in the year 2012. But thereafter he tendered his resignation of primary membership of Shiv Sena on 21.02.2012 and his resignation was accepted by the concerned authority. He was informed accordingly vide letter dated 10.03.2012 and since then, he has no concern with any political party. It is his contention that he has produced the said documents before the respondent No. 3 and considering the said documents, the respondent No. 3 has passed impugned order dated 13.06.2016. It is his contention that on the date of his appointment he was not affiliated to any political party and he was not Member of Gram Panchayat and, therefore, respondent No. 3 had rightly rejected the objection of the applicant by order dated 13.06.2016. It is his contention that by impugned order dated 27.06.2016 the respondent No. 4 has rightly appointed him as Police Patil. It is his contention that the impugned orders are legal one and therefore, he supported those orders.

7. I have heard Shri A.D. Gadekar, learned Advocate for the applicant, Shri V.R. Bhumkar, learned presenting Officer for respondent Nos. 1 to 3 and Shri D.T. Devane, learned Advocate for respondent No. 4. I have perused the documents placed on record by both the parties.

8. Admittedly, the respondent No. 4 and other aspiring candidates filled online applications for the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad in pursuance of the advertisement published by the respondent No. 3, on 25.02.2016. Admittedly, the applicant, respondent No. 4, and other eligible candidates were called for written examination. The applicant, respondent No. 4 and other candidates appeared for written examination and the applicant and respondent No. 4 passed the written examination and they were called for the oral interview. After oral interviews, the respondent No. 4 scored 65 marks in aggregate, while the applicant scored 60 marks in aggregate. The respondent No. 4 scored highest marks and stood first in merit, while the applicant stood second in merit. Admittedly, on 4.3.2016 the applicant filed the objection challenging the candidature of the respondent No. 4 on the ground that he was a sitting Member of the Gram Panchayat, Amdabad and also Vice President of School Management Committee at the time of filing the application and, therefore, he was not eligible for participating in the recruitment process. She has produced documents along with the objection. The respondent No. 3 made enquiry in the objection filed by the applicant and rejected it on 17.03.2016 on the ground that the

respondent No. 4 tendered his resignation of Membership of Gram Panchayat and Vice Chairmanship of School Management Committee on 17.03.2016 and at the time of his appointment he was not holding those posts and therefore, he had issued appointment order dated 27.06.2016 in favour of respondent No. 4. It is not much disputed that on the date of filling the application, as well as, on the date of verification of the documents and at the time of written examination, the respondent No. 4 was a sitting Member of Gram Panchayat, Amdabad and he was working as Vice President of School Management Committee. The respondent No. 4 subsequently resigned from the above said posts on 17.03.2016 and his resignations had been accepted thereafter.

9. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the advertisement dated 25.02.2016 produced on record at paper book page nos. 13 to 23 specifically provides terms and conditions for selection of the candidates for the post of Police Patil. He has attracted my attention to condition No. 6 of the page No. 19, which provides that the applicant shall not be affiliated to any political party, he should not run business of permanent nature in the same village and he should not be a full time employee and he should not be run full time business. He should not be a

Member of Gram Panchayat as well as Member of any private or Semi Government Institute. He should tender affidavit on stamp paper of Rs. 100/- at the time of verification of the documents. He has submitted that the documents in that regard are to be verified after written examination and before calling candidates for the oral interview as mentioned in the condition No. 6, which is at paper book page No. 19. He has argued that the said condition has been again reproduced at paper book page No. 23 as point No. 5. He has argued that in view of the condition No. 12 mentioned at paper book page no. 25 the recruiting authority has authority and power to cancel the candidature of any person who submits false information, if it is found that he suppressed the material information. He has submitted that the said terms and conditions are specifically provide that the candidate who wants to apply for the post of Police Patil, shall not be a Member of Gram Panchyat and, therefore, candidature of the respondent No. 4 ought to have been rejected by the respondent No. 3 on the ground that the respondent No. 4 was sitting Member of the Gram Panchayat on the date of filing of his application, as the respondent No. 4 has admitted the said fact. He has submitted that the respondent No. 3 has not considered the said aspect and rejected his objection on the ground that the respondent no. 4 tendered his resignation on 17.03.2016 i.e. before his

appointment on the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad, and there is no violation of any recruitment Rules or terms and conditions mentioned in the advertisement.

10. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the respondent No. 3 has ignored the provisions of Recruitment Rules of Police Patil as well as terms and conditions of the advertisement. He ought to have rejected the application of the respondent No. 4 and he should not have called the respondent No. 4 for oral interview, as the respondent No. 4 was Member of Gram Panchayat at that time. He has submitted that the respondent No. 4 filed affidavit stating that he was not Member of Gram Panchayat thereafter thereby giving false information and therefore, on that ground also the respondent No. 3 ought to have rejected his application. He has submitted that the impugned orders dated 13.06.2016 and 27.06.2016 are not in accordance with the Recruitment Rules of Police Patil and therefore, he prayed to allow the present Original Application by quashing the impugned orders dated 13.06.2016 and 27.06.2016.

11. Learned Presenting Officer has submitted that the criteria of the eligibility of the applicants have to be considered at the time of appointment of the candidate on the post of Police

Patil. He has argued that the respondent No. 4 was Member of the Gram Panchayat of village Amdabad at the time of filing the application for the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad, but he had resigned from the said post on 17.03.2016 and his resignation has been accepted by the Gram Panchayat and, therefore, the respondent No. 3 had rightly rejected the objection of the applicant by passing impugned order dated 13.06.2016. He has submitted that thereafter, respondent No. 3 issued impugned order dated 27.06.2016 appointing respondent No. 4 on the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad. He has submitted that on the date of appointment, the respondent No. 4 was not Member of Gram Panchayat or not holding any post of Vice President of private or Government/Semi Government Institute and therefore, the respondent No. 3 has issued impugned order dated 27.06.2016. Therefore, he supported the impugned orders.

12. Learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 has submitted that on the date of appointment of respondent No. 4 as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad he was not affiliated to any political party and he was not holding any post having office of profit and therefore, he supported the orders passed by the respondent No. 3 in that regard. He has further

argued that the respondent No. 4 resigned from the post of Member of Gram Panchayat and Vice President of School Management Committee much before his appointment and there is no condition in the advertisement or Recruitment Rules that the person who is a Member of Gram Panchayat is not eligible for applying for the post of Police Patil. He has submitted that the respondent No. 4 has not submitted false information to the respondent No. 3 and therefore, no question of giving false information by the respondent No. 4 arises. He has submitted that on the date of his appointment i.e. on 27.06.2016 the respondent No. 4 was not Member of Gram Panchayat and Vice President of School Management Committee. His appointment cannot be said to be illegal and therefore, he supported the impugned orders.

13. On perusing of the documents on record, it reveals that the respondent No. 3 issued proclamation/advertisement dated 25.02.2016 and invited applications from the eligible candidates for the appointment on the post of Police Patil of different villages situated in Kannad Taluka including village Amdabad. The advertisement is at paper book page nos. 13 to 26. Terms and conditions of the recruitment process were mentioned

at paper book page No. 19 and the relevant terms and conditions are reproduced as follows:-

"fuoll dkk; i/nrih vVih 'lrh'

1- -----

2- -----

3- *yfth ijh{k vrehyrl{lrhl lbh ik= vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ kj vlo'; d ik=rk o vlllykbu vtlr Hkjysh ekgrh ; RP; k vk/kjse{ dloxni=s iMrIG.kh dj. ; k djrkrvfje Lo: ik ; kh tlgj dj. ; lr ; by- T; k vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ kj vlo'; d ik=rk o vlllykbu vtlr Hkjysh ekgrh{ijh{k 'ld e{ dloxni=RP; k vk/kjsijj iul{ll /n glby v'kp vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ Hjr i fdz B; k igly VII; kdjrk dj. ; lr ; by- tlgjlrtr uen dysyh i ul{vgz{k vlllykbu vtlr Hkjysh ekgrh o e{ dloxni=s rikl .RP; k oSh l knj dysyh dloxni=s ; le/; srQlor vk-GV; kl vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ HjrRP; k dBY; lgh VI; koj jnn glw'kdy- rlp v'k vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ 'ld bR; knl kj[; k l oyrrh uke{y dj. ; lr ; shy- ; lph dkk; kul ?; loh*

4- -----

5- -----

6- *vtzhj dlsR; lgh jkt dh; i {k'kh l e{lr ul lok vtzhjlpstlgjlrhu{ k xloh LFWud Lo: i lpk mn; lx dj. Hjk ul lok R; kpi ek ls brj fBdk.kh l ul{ oG ukdjhok/lok dj. Hjk ul lok i ul{ oG ukdjhok dj. Hjk ul lok ; kckrps: - 100@ : lk; RP; k LVIII isjojhy ifrKli=] dloxni= iMrIG.RP; k oSh l knj dj. ls vlo'; d jlgly-*

14. Conditions No. 5 on Page No. 23 and 12 on page No. 25 are also material and relevant in this case. Hence, same are reproduced herein below:-

"vlllykbu ½Online½vtzdj. ; lph i/nr-

5- *yfth ijh{k gh menoljlpstlgjlrhu{ dloxni=s rikl .kh u djrk ?syh tk Hkj vI Y; kusdoG yfth ijh{k cl ifnY; le{smenoljlyk fuoll{ckr dlskr lgh gDd jlg. Hkj ulgh*

fo'ksh I puk

***12- fuoM ifdz; k I q >K; kurj menoljhus vtK; fnysh elgrh vxj [Ksh
 dloxni=s I kj dY; kps fdok [Ksh elgrh nllow BAY; kps fun'kud vK; k R; k
 menoljkd fuoM ifdz; P; k dksR; lgh VII; koj vik= Bjo.; kr ; bY- rI p fuq Drh > kyh
 vI Y; k dksRtgh i nZl puku nskR; kphfu; Drh I ekr dj.; kr ; bY o R; kfo: /n
 dk; nshj dk; bgh dj.; kr ; bY-***

15. On going through the above said condition No. 6, it is crystal clear that the candidate, who intends/desires to apply for the post of Police Patil, shall not be affiliated to any political party. He should not run full time business or shall not be in full time employment. He should not be a Member of Gram Panchayat, as well as Member of private or Semi Government Institute. He has to produce affidavit on stamp paper of Rs. 100/- at the time of verification of the documents. The stage of verification of document has been fixed after result of the written examination. The said stage is after the written examination and before the oral interview. The said condition specifically provides that the Member of the Gram Panchayat is not eligible for applying the post of Police Patil.

16. In the instant case, the respondent No. 4, who was Member of the Gram Panchayat, Amdabad at the time of filing of application had applied for the said post. Not only this, but he appeared for the written examination and after declaring the

result he filed affidavit on stamp paper of Rs. 100/- as mentioned in the condition No. 6 affirming the fact that he was not sitting Member of the Gram Panchayat at the time of filing of the affidavit i.e. on 23.05.2016. In fact, his candidature ought to have been rejected by the respondent No. 3 at the stage of verification of documents and after the result of written examination on the ground that he was active Member of Gram Panchayat at the time of filing the application, as well as, at the time of written examination. Not only this, but the respondent No. 3 ought to have rejected his candidature on the ground that the respondent No. 4 had not filed affidavit on stamp paper of Rs. 100/-, stating that he was not sitting/active Member of any political party at the time of filing the application at the time of scrutiny of documents before oral interview. It is also material to note here that the respondent No. 4 was Vice President of School Management Committee, when he filed the application for the post of Police Patil. The respondent No. 4 resigned from the Membership of Grampanchayat, as well as, from the post of Vice President of School Management, Amdabad, after declaration of the merit list of the candidates, who appeared for the oral interviews. It also shows that he was not eligible to apply for the post of Police Patil at the time of filing of the application, but this aspect has not been considered by the respondent no. 3, while deciding the

objection of the applicant. The respondent No. 3 had not considered the terms and conditions mentioned in the advertisement with proper perspective. He ought to have rejected the application of the respondent No. 4 on the ground that he was sitting/active Member of Gram Panchayat and working as a Vice President of School Management Committee of village Amdabad, at the time of filing his application. But he has not considered the said aspect properly and wrongly rejected the objection application filed by the applicant. Reasons recorded by the respondent No. 3 while issuing the impugned order dated 13.06.2016 is not in accordance with the terms and conditions mentioned in the advertisement. Reasons recorded by him while rejecting the objection of the applicant are not proper and correct and they are perverse, therefore, the impugned orders require to be quashed and set aside.

17. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the similar issue has been involved in O.A. No. 352 of 2016 in case of **Sow Sangita W/o Balkishan Sangle Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others** decided by this Tribunal **on 22.11.2016** and this Tribunal has allowed the Original Application and canceled the appointment of respondent No. 4 therein on the ground that she was serving as a Member of Village

Panchayat at the time of filing of application for the post of Police Patil. He has submitted that the said decision is squarely applicable to the present case and therefore, he prayed to allow the present Original Application.

18. Learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 and learned Presenting Officer have submitted that the post of Police Patil is a civil post, but all the provisions of Conduct Rules would not be applicable to the said post. They have submitted that the office bearer or Member of local body may be considered for the post of Police Patil, but he should not be appointed as a Police Patil, but he can be appointed only on his actual resignation from that body being effective. In support of their contentions, they have placed reliance on the letter dated 10.05.1983 issued by the Desk Officer, Home Department, Government of Maharashtra, wherein clarification on some points have been given by the Government. The relevant paragraph is reproduced as follows:-

"2. The Police Patil of a village is Government's resident representative in the village. Looking to his status, role and responsibilities he is not expected to involve himself in any political activity. In terms of Rule 5 of the Maharashtra Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1979 a Police Patil is precluded from taking part in politics or in an election to any legislature or local authority. A candidate for a

post of Police Patil should not be a member or be otherwise associated with any political party or organization taking part in politics. An office-bearer or member of a local body who is a candidate for a post of Police Patil may be considered for such post but he could be appointed Police Patil only on his actual resignation from that body being effective. "

19. They have also placed reliance on the judgment in case of *Sunita w/o Navnath Gudhage Vs. District Collector, Ahmednagar and others reported in 2015 (6) Mh. L.J. 393.*

20. They have further placed reliance on the judgment delivered by this Tribunal in O.A. No. 495/2014 in case of *Viresh Abasaheb Gade Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others decided on 28.08.2015.*

21. I have gone through the above said decisions referred by both the parties. The decisions referred by the learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 and learned Presenting Officer are not attracted in the instant case, as the facts in those cases and facts in the present case are different and not identical. The guidelines issued by the Government in the letter dated 10.05.1983 is by way of clarification and it has no overriding effect over the Recruitment Rules. The advertisement dated

25.02.2016 had been issued considering the various G.Rs. and Recruitment Rules for the post of Police Patil, where it has been specifically mentioned that the Member of Gram Panchayat is not eligible for the appointment for the post of Police Patil. It shows that on the date of filing the application he should not be a Member of any Village Panchayat and, therefore, the clarification given by the Desk Officer is not much useful to the respondent No. 4 in this case. Therefore, I do not find substance in the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 in that regard.

22. The facts in the present case and the facts in the above cited decision rendered by this Tribunal in case of **Sow Sangita W/o Balkishan Sangle Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others on 22.11.2016** are identical. Issues involved in that case are similar to the issues involved in the present case. Therefore, the said decision is relevant in the instant case. Therefore, impugned orders dated 13.06.2016 passed by the respondent No. 3 rejecting the objection of the applicant is not legal one and it is perverse to the terms and conditions mentioned in the advertisement dated 25.02.2016. Therefore, the said order is not maintainable. The subsequent order appointing the respondent No. 4 on the post of Police Patil of village Amdabad,

Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad issued by the respondent No. 3 on 27.06.2016 is also no legal one. Therefore, both the orders are required to be quashed and set aside by allowed the present Original Application.

23. In view of above discussions in foregoing paragraphs, I proceed to pass following order:-

ORDER

1. The Original Application is allowed.
2. The impugned order dated 13.06.2016 issued by the respondent No. 3 rejecting the objection of the applicant challenging the selection of the respondent No. 4 and the order dated 27.06.2016 appointing the respondent No. 4 as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad issued by the respondent No. 3 are hereby quashed and set aside.
3. The respondent No. 3 is directed to take steps to appoint the applicant as Police Patil of village Amdabad, Tq. Kannad, Dist. Aurangabad, if she is otherwise eligible.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

Later On

After pronouncement of this order, the learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 has submitted that the respondent No. 4 is working as a Police Patil, but his appointment has been cancelled by this Tribunal by an order dated 30.11.2017 (today). He has submitted that the respondent No. 4 desires to approach the Hon'ble High Court, challenging the judgment and order passed by this Tribunal today, and therefore, he requests to stay the operation and execution of this order for a period of one week and sought time to approach the Hon'ble High Court.

As the respondent No. 4 wants to challenge the order passed by this Tribunal today, operation and execution of this order is stayed till 8th December, 2017.

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

DATE : 30-11-2017.
PLACE : AURANGABAD.