

**MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH**

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/1318 /2017  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,  
Free Press Journal Marg,  
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date : 29 MAR 2017

**M.A. Nos. 34 to 39/2017 With M.A. Nos. 40 to 45/2017 IN  
O.A. Nos. 1069 to 1074/2016.  
(Sub :- Police Patil)**

- 1 The State of Maharashtra & Ors., Through C.P.O., M.A.T, Mumbai-21.  
C/o. Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, C.P.O., M.A.T., Mumbai-21.

.....**APPLICANT/S.**

**VERSUS**

1. Smt. Pratibha K. Sahane & Ors.,  
C/o. Shri P.S. Pathak, Advocate for the Applicants.  
Add. O/at. #1, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Panthaky House, Maruti Cross Lane, D.N. Road,  
Fort, Mumbai-01.

...**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 **22<sup>nd</sup>** day of **March , 2017** has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE : Shri N.K. Rajpurohit, C.P.O., for the Applicants (Ori. Resp.)  
Shri P.S. Pathak, Advocate for the Respondents.(Ori. Appl.)

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

DATE : **22.03.2017.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

*Malik*  
29/3/2017

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

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
Appearance, Tribunal's orders or  
directions and Registrar's orders

Tribunal's orders

**MA 34 to 39/2017 with MA 40 to  
45/2017 in O.As. 1069 to 1074/2016**

**The State of Mah. & ors. ... Applicants  
(Ori. Resps.)**

**Vs.**

**Smt. P.K. Sahane ... Respondent  
(Ori. Applicant)**

Heard Mr. N.K. Rajpurohit, the learned Presenting Officer for the Applicants (Ori. Respondents) and Mr. P.S. Pathak, the learned Advocates for the Respondents (Ori. Applicants).

These MAs can be disposed of by this common order. By these MAs, Collector, Nashik and the State Government seek vacation of the order whereby cost of Rs.500/- in each of these matter was imposed by the order dated 19.12.2016 made by the Hon'ble Vice-Chairman.

I have heard both the sides. It does appear that the primary responsibility of filing the reply was on the S.D.O., Niphad and, therefore, the imposition of cost on the Collector, Nashik and the State Government is something that can be reconsidered. In all fairness, Mr. Pathak has no objection, if the order such as it is prayed for is made. The order imposing cost as above made against the Collector, Nashik and the State Government stands hereby vacated and it need not now deposit the same amount of cost. The MAs are allowed accordingly with no order as to costs.

**DATE: 22/3/17**

**CORAM:**

~~Hon'ble Smt. RAJIV AGARWAL~~

~~(Vice Chairman)~~

Hon'ble Smt. R. B. MALIK (Member) J

**APPEARANCE:**

Shri/Smt. N.K. Rajpurohit

~~C.P.O.~~

~~Advocate for the Applicant~~

Shri/Smt. P.S. Pathak

~~C.P.O./Adv. for the Respondents~~

~~Adv.~~

~~Adj. To M.As. are allowed.~~

sd/-  
(R.B. Malik) 22-3-17  
Member (J)  
22.03.2017

(skw)

**TRUE COPY**

*Malik*  
22/3/2017  
Asstt. Registrar/Research Officer  
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal  
Mumbai