

*Thakur*

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH**

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/1170 /2016  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,  
Free Press Journal Marg,  
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date : 5 APR 2016

**M.A. No. 138/2016 IN O.A. No. 253/2016.**  
**(Sub :- Promotion)**

- 1 The Chief Secretary, State of Maha.,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-400 032.
- 2 The Addl. Chief Secretary, Home  
Dept., Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 3 The D.G. of Police, M.S., S.B. Marg,  
Colaba, Mumbai.

**.....APPLICANT/S. (Ori. Resp.)**  
**VERSUS**

- 1 Shri Babasaheb D. Koli,  
R/at. Swargate Police Colony, 6/1/2, Police Officers Quarter, Swargate,  
Pune-411 037.

**...RESPONDENT/S (Ori. Appli.)**

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 31<sup>th</sup> day of **March , 2016** has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE : Ms. N.G. Gohad, P.O. holding for Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, C.P.O.  
for the Applicants (Ori. Resp.)  
Smt. P. Mahajan, Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Appli.)

CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI R.B. MALIK, MEMBER (J).**

DATE : **31.03.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

*Masal*  
*5/4/2016*  
**Research Officer,**  
**Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,**  
**Mumbai.**

# ASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

of 20

DISTRICT

..... Applicant/s

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

da of Coram,  
rds or  
s orders

Tribunal's orders

## M.A.138/2016 in O.A.253/2016

Heard Ms. N.G. Gohad holding for Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Ori. Respondents) and Smt. Punam Mahajan, learned Advocate for the Respondent (Ori. Applicant).

Smt. Mahajan, the learned Advocate on notice waives service.

Hearing rival submissions, I find absolutely no reason to protract this matter. The original Applicant being the Respondent herein has not filed Affidavit-in-reply and in fact, none is necessary. Taking all aspects into consideration while making interim orders in this OA on 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016, I had granted the time as I did. A copy of my order is annexed hereto and the same is self-speaking. I do not have to add anything at all to the same. It appears that the Applicant has also initiated contempt proceedings with the learned P.O. informs has now been adjourned to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2016. Be it as it may, as far as I am concerned, I find absolutely no reason to grant extension of time. The interim order made by me, itself furnishes all the justification for not doing so. There is reason to believe that the dragging of feet was purposely adopted by the Respondents. The Applicant is set to retire today and apart from making whatever observations I did in my order above referred to, if anything more was to be said, it would be quite plainly incongruous. No case is made out. Therefore, the MA stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(R.B. Malik) 31.3.16  
Member (J)  
31.03.2016

(skw)

[PTO]

Asstt. Registrar / Research Officers  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Mumbai

TRUE COPY

31/3/16