IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI

MISC. APPLICATION NO.95 OF 2016
In
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 197 OF 2016

Shri Deepak Atmaram Shirodkar.)
Retired as Divisional Forest Officer,)
From the establishment of res. no. 2.)
Residing at: At and Post Mhadevache)
Keerawade, Taluka Kudal,)
Dist. Sindhudurga.)**...Applicant**

VERSUS

1. Shri. Rajaram Subrao Patil.)
Range Forest Officer,)
Kankavli Forest Division,)
Sawantwadi, Dist. Sindhudurga.)
Residing at RFO Quarters,)
Forest Camp, At and Post Janvali,)
Taluka Kankavli, Dist. Sindhudurga.)**....Respondent (Org. Applicant)**

2. The State of Maharashtra through)
The Principal Secretary,)
Revenue and Forest Department,)
Mantralaya, Mumbai – 400 032.)

3. The Chief Conservator of Forest, (T).)
Vanvardhan, Opp. Head Post Office,)
Tarabai Park, Kolhapur 416 003.)

4. The Deputy Conservator of Forest)
Sawantwadi, Vanbhavan,)
Salaiwada, Taluka Sawantwadi,)
Dist. Sindhudurga, 416 510.)....**Respondent**
(Org. Respondents No.1 to 3)

Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant.

Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocte for the Respondent No.1.

Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents No.2 to 4.

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

DATE : 24 .02. 2016

JUDGMENT

1. This Misc. Application is presented by Shri Deepak Atmaram Shirodkar seeking impleadment to this O.A.

2. I have perused the Application and heard Ms. S.P. Manchekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Respondents No.1 in the Original Application and Smt. K.S. Gaikwad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents No.2 to 4 (State).

3. This M.A. can be safely disposed of on the basis of statement made by the learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri Lonkar. The reason why the Applicant who is otherwise not directly involved at all in the present facts in this O.A. is that he himself is an Ex- Divisional Forest officer. On his complaint the original Applicant has been proceeded against and in the manner of speaking forced to go on leave.

4. In the O.A. allegations are made against, this Applicant of the M.A. touching his character and documents have also been annexed. These facts are urged and in all fairness to Mr. Lonkar were set out in arguments with necessary moderation yesterday.

5. Therefore the Applicant of this M.A. seeks impleadment to clear any cloud around his name and also by intervening to be a party Respondent. He also seeks stay to the O.A. itself.

6. However, with all that has been mentioned above the contraversy gets resolved because Mr. Lonkar makes a statement that whatever may have been mentioned against the Applicant of this M.A. Shri Deepak Shirodkar supported with documents in that behalf and the circumstances emanating therefrom are withdrawn by the original Applicant and upon that statement Ms. Manchekar makes a statement at the bar that her client does not want to press this M.A. It is therefore directed that para no.7.4 of the O.A. and annexure pages no.23 to 29 stand withdrawn and shall not

be taken in to the consideration to decide this O.A. This M.A. is accordingly disposed of with no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(R.B. MALIK) 24.02.16
(MEMBER) (J)

Date : 24.02.2016
Place : Mumbai
Dictation taken by : SBA
D:\savita\2016\February, 2016\M.A.No.95 of 2016 in O.A.No.197 of 2016.doc