Thanks S

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/ 723 /2016
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.

Date : 23 FEB 2016

O.A. No. 131/2016 With O.A. No. 132/2016. (D.B.)
(Sub :- Promotion)

1. Shri Santosh B. Kasekar, (O.A. No. 131/2016)
2. Shri Dinesh J. Ghume, (O.A. No. 132/2016)
   C/o. Shri M.D. Lonkar, Advocate for the Applicants.

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

VERSUS

1 The Govt. of Maharashtra, Through Secretary, Finance Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai-400 032.
2 Commissioner of Sales Tax, having his office at Vikrikar Bhavan, Mazgaon, Mumbai-400 010.
3 Special Commissioner, Sales Tax, M.S., Mumbai, having his office at Vikrikar Bhavan, Mazgaon, Mumbai-10.
4 General Manager, Govt. Canteen, Vikrikar Bhavan, Mazgaon, Mumbai-10.

...**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 ***22nd*** day *of* ***February, 2016*** *has made the following order:-*

APPEARANCE : Shri M.D. Lonkar, Advocate for the Applicant.
Ms. N.G. Gohad, P.O. for the Respondents.

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

DATE : **22.02.2016.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

Directed 23/2/16

Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.

Tribunal's orders

Date : 22.2.2016

O.A. No. 131 of 2016 With O.A.No.132 of 2016 (D.B.)

1. Heard Shri M.D. Lonkar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the respondents.

2. These two Original Applications can be disposed of here and now for the reasons to be presently set out.

3. The applicants in both these Original Applications which are being disposed of by this common judgment are working in Class-IV capacity in Government canteen, Sales Tax Department, Mumbai. They have been making representations inter-alia for promotion to Class-III posts.

4. In these Original Applications, only relief that is being sought is for a direction to the respondents to decide the pending representations of the applicants early so that they could know their position as it where.

5. In view of the facts set out herein above, I declined to accept the request of the learned C.P.O. for time to file Affidavit-in-Reply because of the fact that time at the disposal of the respondents was already sufficient and in any case the scope hereof is limited.

6. Having heard the rival submissions, I find that there is a fair degree of justification in applicants making request for early decision of their representations one way or other, nothing beyond that is sought and therefore beyond that nothing can be granted. In my opinion, regard being had to circumstances such as they are the respondents must decide pending representations of the applicants within a period of two months from today.

7. The respondents shall decide the representations dated 16.1.2014 and 26.2.2014 in O.A.No.131/2016 (S.B. Kasekar) and the representation dated 10.3.2015 in O.A.No.132/2016 (D.J. Ghume) within a period of two months from today and communicate the decision to the applicants within one week thereafter.

8. Original Applications are allowed in these terms with no order as to costs. Hamdast allowed.

(R.B. Malik) 22.2.16
Member(J)

vso

/TRUE COPY/

23/2/16

Asst. Registrar / Research Officers
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal