Thakur

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/ 3659 /2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.
Date : 4 OCT 2016

C.A. No. 42/2016 IN O.A. No. 1092/2013 With O.A. No. 1031/2013.

1. Shri Padmakar S. Mahamuni & 03 Ors.,
C/o. Shri R.M. Kolge, Advocate for the Applicants.

....**APPLICANT/S.**

VERSUS

1 Dr. Sanjay Chahande, The Principal Secretary, Higher & Technical Education Dept., Extention Bhavan 4th Floor, Mumbai-32.

2 Shri Vijay Waghmare, The Commissioner / Director for Vocational Education & Training, M.S., 3, Mahanagar Palika Marg, Mumbai-01.

3 Shri Chandrakant A. Ninale, Joint Director for Vocational Education & Training, Regional Dept., Ghole Rd., Shivaji Nagar, Pune-05.

...**RESPONDENT**/S

Copy to : The C.P.O. M.A.T., Mumbai.

The applicant/s above named has filed an application as per copy already served on you, praying for reliefs as mentioned therein. The Tribunal on the ***28th*** day *of* ***September, 2016*** *has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Shri R.M. Kolge, Advocate for the Applicants.
Shri A.J. Chougule, P.O. for the Respondents.

CORAM : **HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN.**

DATE : **28.09.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Jaisal 3/10/2016

Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.

Tribunal's orders

Date : 28.09.2016.

C.A.No.42 of 2016 in O.A.No.1092 of 2013 with O.A.No.1031 OF 2013

P.S. Mahamuni & Ors. **.... Applicants.**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. **....Respondents.**

1. Heard Shri R.M. Kolge, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. In the end of hearing, it has transpired that according to the Applicants certain part of the order still remains to be complied with.

3. It is not shown that Applicants have brought to the Respondents the exact deficiency which leads the disobedience of the order. In this situation it will be extremely difficult to take cognizance of the Contempt.

4. At this stage, learned Advocate Shri R.M. Kolge states that Applicants be granted liberty to withdraw this application with liberty to make suitable representation/ and thereafter give notice of contempt to every individual who could be denoted to be liable for contempt, and only, thereafter, if necessary, give adequate notice not less than 4 weeks of proposed motion for Contempt, if costs still survive.

5. In view of the foregoing, C.A. is disposed as withdrawn.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman

prk

TRUE COPY
3/10/2016
Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Mumbai.