

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI**

**MISC. APPLICATION NO.291 OF 2017
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1010 OF 2016**

DISTRICT : Mumbai

State of Maharashtra,)
Through the Secretary,)
Tribal Development Dept.)
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.)..Applicant
(Ori. Respondent 1)

VERSUS

1. Smt. Manda V. Deshmukh,)
Retired Joint Commissioner,)
Tribal Development Dept., Mantralaya,)
Mantralaya, Mumbai, R/at.D-401,)
Archit Royal Apartment, Mahatma)
Nagar, Nashik – 422007.)...Respondent
(Ori. Applicant)
2. Principal Secretary, General Admn.Dept.)
(Services), Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.)..Applicant
(Ori.Respt. No. 2)
3. Principal Secretary, Finance Dept.,)
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.)..Applicant
(Ori. Respt. No.3)

Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned C.P.O. for the Applicant
(Ori. Respondent)

Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Respondent
(Ori. Applicant).

CORAM : Shri R.B. Malik, Member (J)

DATE : 8th August, 2017

ORDER

1. This Misc. Application is moved by the Original Respondent State seeking extension of time to comply with my order dated 06.04.2017 while disposing of O.A. No.1010/2016. Time was granted of three months for compliance which expired on 05.07.2017. The learned C.P.O. brought to my notice the further facts that there was a proceeding for speaking to the minutes. That related to the statement of a fact that in the O.A., it was mentioned that Contempt Application was still pending while it was not pending. That was not the matter of great moment. The crux of the M.A. is that on various dates moves were made in the direction to challenge the judgment in the OA. The various steps have been indicated including the moving of Law and Judiciary Department, contacting the Counsel either panel or special.

2. The learned C.P.O. wanted the order to be deferred for some time so that he would be able to take instructions about the status of the proceeding before the Hon'ble High Court, if any.

3. The learned Advocate informed that the Original Applicant has filed a Caveat but till yesterday evening no notice was received by him.

4. If, I have correctly understood the case of the Applicant (Ori. Respondent) they want to challenge the order disposing of the OA. Three months time was considered appropriate and whatever steps had to be taken ought to have been taken by them in good time. As far as the request of the learned C.P.O. for deferring the passing of the order, I find granting all attitude to the Misc. Applicant even if the W.P. has been filed further steps are to be taken before the Hon'ble High Court. I find no justification in granting further time.

5. Misc. Application is accordingly rejected with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(R.B. MALIK)
MEMBER (J)
08.08.2017

Date : 08.08.2017

Place : Mumbai

Dictation taken by : VSM

E:\VSO\2017\August 2017\M.A.291 of 2017.doc