

THAKUR

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/ 4651 /2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.
Date : 16 DEC 2016

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 1152 OF 2016.
(Sub :- Decide the Representations)**

- 1 Shri Baburao B. Bodake,
R/at. Govt. Quarters, Block No.2, Behind Tahasil Office,
Khed (Rajgurunagar), Dist. Pune.

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

VERSUS

1. State of Maharashtra, Through Chief Secretary, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue & Forest Dept., Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
3. The Addl. Chief Secretary, G.A.D., Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Pune Division, Council Hall, Pune-411 001.

...**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 13th day of **December, 2016** has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Smt. Punam Mahajan, Advocate for the Applicant.
Smt. A.B. Kololgi, P.O. for the Respondents.

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

DATE : **13.12.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Arasal
16/12/2016

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

.....)
versus

tate of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

.....)
um,

Tribunal's orders

O.A.1152/2016

Shri B.B. Bodake

... Applicant

Vs.

The State of Mah. & ors.

... Respondents

Heard Smt. Punam Mahajan, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. A.B. Kololgi, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

This OA can be disposed of at this stage itself, regardless of whether the Respondents give consent or not because such are the facts herein involved. It so happened that pursuant to an order made by this Tribunal on 25.6.2014, the Applicant ultimately came to be promoted vide the order dated 29th June, 2016 which is Annexure "A-4" (Page 15 of the Paper Book) and thereafter, he has moved the Respondents for deemed date by his representation of 25.11.2016. The ultimate relief that is sought herein is for a direction to the 2nd Respondent to decide the said representation within a period of one month from the order of this Tribunal. A period of close to two months has already elapsed. I do not think, the matter is so intricate as to be kept pending. I am, therefore, of the opinion that this OA can be and is being hereby disposed of with a direction to the 2nd Respondent to decide the representation of the Applicant of 25.11.2016 within two months from today and communicate its outcome to him within one week thereafter. No order as to costs.

(R.B. Malik) 13-12-16

Member (J)

13.12.2016

(skw)

TRUE COPY

Asst. Secy. to the Tribunal, Officer
Maharashtra State Tribunal
MUMBAI

[P.T.O.]