

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NAGPUR BENCH NAGPUR
ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.1077 of 2022 (S.B.)

1. Shri Rohidas Bhika Rathod,
Aged about 56 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o Belaghan, Tah. Pusad, Distt.: Yavatmal.
2. Shri Dipak Ramrao Shastrakar,
Aged about 56 yrs., Occu.: Service,
R/o. Siddhi Vinayak, Digras, Distt.: Yavatmal.
3. Shri Ganesh Pandurang Ghuge,
Aged about 53 yrs., Occu.: Service,
R/o. Ambika Nagar, Digras, Distt.: Yavatmal.
4. Shri Mahadeo Namdeo Ananyawar,
Aged about 60 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Kolura, Tah. Digras, Distt.: Yavatmal.
5. Shri Vilas Nagoji Tile,
Aged about 54 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Dattapur, Tah. Digras, Distt.: Yavatmal.
6. Shri Mangilal Mohan Ade,
Aged about 49 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Marwadi (Khurd), Tah.: Pusad, Distt.: Yavatmal.
7. Shri Vasanta Chandu Ade,
Aged about 49 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Marwadi (Khurd), Tah.: Pusad, Distt.: Yavatmal.
8. Shri Khandu Narayan Rathod,
Aged about 61 yrs., Occu.: Retired
R/o. Pimpalkhuta, Tah. Pusad, Distt. : Yavatmal.
9. Shri Naresh Natthu Ade,
Aged about 56 yrs., Occu. Service, R/o. Dhuti Jewaswar,
Tah. Pusad, Distt. Yavatmal.
10. Shri Jaywanta Tukaram Pawar,
Aged about 60 yrs., Occu.: Service,
R/o. Pimpalkhuta, Tah. : Pusad, Distt. Yavatmal.

11. Shri Ramrao Laxman Pawar,
Aged about 52 yrs., Occu.: Service,
R/o. Sewadas (Wadad), Mahagaon,
Tah.: Pusad, Distt.: Yavatmal.
12. Shri Manohar Narayan Sarkunde,
Aged about 61 yrs., Occu. Retired,
R/o. Amrut Nagar, Tah. Pusad, Distt. : Yavatmal.
13. Shri Bhagwan Sadashiv Ingole,
Aged about 59 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Khandala, Tah. Pusad, Distt.: Yavatmal.
14. Shri Rama Gattu Jadhav,
Aged about 63 yrs., Occu. Retired,
R/o. Govindpur, Tah. Umarkhed, Distt. Yavatmal.
15. Shri Sheshrao Pandurang Babhade,
Aged about 48 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Krushnapur, Tah. Umarkhed, Distt. Yavatmal.
16. Shri Dadarao Haribhau Umbarkar,
Aged about 61 yrs., Occu. Retired,
R/o. Sawda, Tah. Arni, Distt.: Yavatmal.
17. Shri Rajendra Kisanrao Gandait,
Aged about 52 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Chausada Road, Waghapur, Distt. : Yavatmal.
18. Shri Ismail Beg Yusuf Beg Mirza,
Aged about 64 yrs., Occu. Retired,
R/o. Hiwari, Distt.: Yavatmal.
19. Shri Chhotu Undraji Rathod,
Aged about 57 yrs., Occu. Service,
R/o. Bhamb Raja, Distt. Yavatmal.

Applicants.

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through its Secretary, Department of Forest & Revenue,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

2. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest,
[Vanbal Pramukh], Maharashtra State,
Civil Lines, Nagpur.
3. The Chief Conservator of Forest, (Territorial),
Yavatmal.

Respondents.

S/Shri G.G. Bade, P.P. Khaparde, Advocates for the applicants.
Smt. S.R. Khobragade, learned P.O. for respondents.

Coram :- Hon'ble Shri Justice M.G. Giratkar,
Vice Chairman.

Dated :- 24/02/2025.

JUDGMENT

Heard Shri G.G. Bade, learned counsel for the applicants
and Smt. S.R. Khobragade, learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. The applicants were working as Van Majoor since 1990
and have worked continuously thereupon. The Government of
Maharashtra has issued G.R. dated 16/10/2012 by virtue of which, the
applicants came to be regularized. The applicants have filed the
present O.A. for treating their earlier service as a regular service.

3. The O.A. is strongly opposed by the respondents. It is
submitted that the applicants are not entitled to get their earlier service
as regular service for the purpose of pension.

4. During the course of submission, the learned counsel for
applicants has pointed out the Judgment of the Hon'ble Bombay High

Court, Bench at Nagpur in Writ Petition No. 6985/2023. The learned P.O. has submitted that the respondents have not taken final decision in respect of claim of applicants. It is pending before respondent no.3.

5. Letter dated 16/02/2022 is pointed out by the learned P.O. It is filed by the applicants. As per this letter, the final decision is not taken by the respondents about the claim of applicants. As per Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 the applicants have to exhaust all the remedies. The remedy which is sought by the applicants is not finally decided by the respondents. As per the letter dated 16/02/2022 the recommendation was made, but it is not finally decided. Therefore, cited decision is not applicable to the case in hand. Hence, the following order -

ORDER

The O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.

Dated :- 24/02/2025.

(Justice M.G. Giratkar)
Vice Chairman.

dnk.

I affirm that the contents of the PDF file order are word to word same as per original Judgment.

Name of P.A. : D.N. Kadam

Court Name : Court of Hon'ble Vice Chairman.

Judgment signed on : 24/02/2025.