

Thakur

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/3517/2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date : 23 SEP 2016

C.A. No. 44/2016 IN O.A. No. 134/2015.

(Sub :- Date of Birth)

- 1 Mr. Bharat C. Pardeshi,
R/at. 104/3568, Nehru Nagar, Kurla (E), Mumbai-24.

....APPLICANT/S.

VERSUS

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 Mr. K.P. Bakshi, The Addl. Chief
Secretary, Home Dept., Mantralaya
Mumbai-400 032. | 2 Mr. Praveen Dikshit, The D.G. of
Police, M.S., S.B.S. Marg, Near
Regal Cinema, Colaba, Mumbai. |
| 3 Mr. Datta Padsalgikar, The
Commissioner of Police for greater
Mumbai, Having Office at Crawford
Market, Near CST, Mumbai. | 4 Mr. D.K. Jain, The Secretary,
Finance Dept., Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32. |
| 5 Mr. Mukesh Khullar, The Secretary
G.A.D., Mantralaya, Mumbai-32. | |

...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 21st day of **September, 2016** has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Shri K.R. Jagdale, Advocate for the Applicant.
Shri A.J. Chougule, P.O. for the Respondents.

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

DATE : **21.09.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Research Officer,
23/9/2016

**Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.**

Date : 21.09.2016.

C.A.No.44 of 2016 in O.A.No.134 of 2015

B.C. Pardeshi

.... Applicant.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.... Respondents.

1. Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. In addition to the affidavit which were filed yesterday, today learned P.O. for the Respondents Shri A.J. Chougule has tendered the affidavit of Shri Naresh S. Ingle, Assistant Desk Officer, Home Department, Mantralaya. It is taken on record.

3. Perusal of the affidavit shows that the matter of the Applicant had lost attention due to pressure of work. Today's affidavit reveals the pressure of work in following language :-

"From January, 2016 to till date, Desk Pol5B has been allotted 5051 reference. Out of which approx.2466 references were marked to me."

(Quoted from page 60 of the affidavit filed on 21.09.2016.)

4. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri K.R. Jagdale states that if initial correspondence and personal visits would have resulted into some healthy communication the situation of filing of Contempt would not be arisen. Moreover now action is taken by the State. Applicant needs liberty to challenge adverse action by the State.

5. In the result, it is observed that no action against the Respondents is necessary and the present Contempt Application is disposed of.

6. Applicant's liberty to challenge adverse order shall remain unaffected.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)

Chairman

prk

TRUE COPY

Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal