

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/3282 /2016 Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4, Free Press Journal Marg, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date:

F- 3 SEP 2016

C.A. NO. 57/2016 IN O.A. NO. 38/2016. (Sub: Stoppage of Increments)

1. Mr. Subhash R. Jadhav, R/at. Rudraksh Residency, R5/F3, Tamjai Nagar, Satara-415002.**APPLICANT/S.**

VERSUS

- 1 Mr. Deepak Kapoor, The Principal Secretary, Department of Higher & Technical Education, Mantralaya Extension Bldg., Mumbai-32.
- 3 Mr. C.A. Ninale, The Joint Director, Vocational Education & Training, Regional Office, Ghole Rd., Pune-5.
- 2 Mr. Vijay Waghmare, The Director, Vocational Education & Training, Mahapalika Marg, Mumbai-01.
- 4 Mrs. Rajguru Vidya, The Principal, Govt. Technical High School, Ghole Road, Pune.

...RESPONDENT/S

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

The applicant/s above named has filed an application as per copy alread served on you, praying for reliefs as mentioned therein. The Tribunal on the **31**th do of **August**, **2016** has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE:

Shri. K.R. Jagdale, Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. Archana B.K., P.O. for the Respondents.

CORAM

HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN.

DATE

31.08.2016.

ORDER

Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

L.O. - 31/08/2016 - Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Research Officer
Maharashtra Administrative Tribuna
Mumbai

E:\Sachin\Judical Order\ORDER-2016\September-16\03.09.2016\C.A. No. 57 of 16 IN O.A. No. 38 of 16-31.08.1

C.A.No.57 of 2016 in ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.38 OF 2016

THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

S.R. Jadhav

.... Applicant.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

....Respondents.

Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

CORAM: JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN

DATE : 31.08.2016.

ORDER

- 1. Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
- 2. Contemnor No.2, Shri Vijay Waghmare, Director, office of Director, Vocational Education & Training has tendered additional Affidavit. It is taken on record.
- 3. On perusal of the affidavit it is revealed that the affidavit does not give any satisfactory explanation towards delay which has resulted in Contempt.
- 4. If the Respondent No.2 wants he can file further affidavit tendering explanation, an apology, as well as, if he is, willing to pay costs to the Applicant he may file appropriate affidavit by tomorrow.
- 5. S.O. to 01.09.2016.

(A.H. Joshi, J.)

- Later on the case was mentioned and was heard.
- 2. Learned P.O. has tendered apology and affidavit written and affirmed by Shri Vijay Waghmare, Director, Vocational Education & Training. It is taken on record. Copy is given to learned Advocate Shri K.R. Jagdale.

- 3. The apology appears to be sincere and can be accepted, however, Respondent No.2 cannot be left free without compensating the Applicant because the Applicant was required to loss time and money for initiating the present C.A..
- 4. Though Respondent No.2 has prayed for not imposing costs, however, in the interest of justice it would be appropriate to order Respondent No.2 to pay to the Applicant costs in the sum of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the Applicant directly by sending demand draft within 30 days from today.
- 5. In view of the apology and order for costs it shall not be necessary to take any action. Hence, Contempt Application proceedings are disposed.
- 6. Disposal does not come in the way of the Applicant to agitate the appropriate challenge to the decision rendered in the appeal.

(A.H. Joshi, J.) Chairman

prk

TRUE COPY

Asstt. Registrar/Research Office Maharashtra Administrative Tribun Mumbai