(18)

[Spl/MAT/F-5/E]

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI BENCH

NO.MAT/MUM/JUD/ 342 /2017
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Pay & Accounts Barrack Nos.3 & 4,
Free Press Journal Marg,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021.
Date : 18 JAN 2017

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 17 OF 2017.
(Sub :- Transfer)

1 Mr. Dipak B. Kamble,
R/at. 301, Shree Ganesh Leela, Plot No. 169 & 170, Sector 10, New Panvel, New Bombay 206.

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

VERSUS

1 The State of Maharashtra, Through The Secretary, Health Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2 The Director, Health Services, Arogya Bhavan, Near C.S.T., Mumbai-01.
3 The Deputy Director,Health Services Mumbai Circle, Thane, Mental Hospital Thane Compound Near Dyansadhana College, Thane (W)

...RESPONDENT/

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 **January, 2017** has made the following order:-

APPEARANCE : Shri K.R. Jagdale, Advocate for the Applicant.
Shri K.B. Bhise, P.O. for the Respondents.

CORAM : **HON'BLE SHRI RAJIV AGARWAL, VICE-CHAIRMAN.**

DATE : **13.01.2017.**

ORDER : Order Copy Enclosed / Order Copy Over Leaf.

18/1/2017

Research Officer,
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal,
Mumbai.

directions and Registrar's orders 7

13.1.17

Coram – Hon'ble Shri Rajiv Agarwal (VC)

Shri K.R. Jagdale adv for the applicant

Shri K.B. Bhise P.O. for the respondents

Heard

order passed in Tribunal's

O.A. is disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs.

Handed

Date : 13.01.2017.

O.A.No.17 of 2017

D.B. Kamble **....Applicant.**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. **....Respondents.**

1. Heard Shri K.R. Jagdale, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Shri K.B. Bhise, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Learned Advocate for the Applicant Shri Jagdale states that this Tribunal may issue directions to consider the representation of the Applicant dated 01.10.2016 for posting him in any of the vacant post in Panvel or Thane on promotion to the post of Assistant Superintendent. Though the order of the promotion was passed on 15.12.2016, this representation of the Applicant was not considered.

3. Learned P.O. for the Respondents Shri K.B. Bhise stated he is not aware as to why no decision was taken on the representation of the Applicant dated 01.10.2016 He of course mentions that such representation are generally considered only after the promotion order are passed.

4. In the meantime this O.A. need not be kept pending. It can safely be disposed for with direction to Respondents No.2 and 3 to consider the representation of the Applicant dated 01.10.2016 regarding posting him on promotion in any of the post vacant at Panvel or Thane.

5. Learned Advocate for the Applicant stated that there is vacancy at Panvel where the Applicant can be accommodated. This factor may also be considered by Respondents No.2 and 3 while taking decision on the above representation of the Applicant. The Respondent may take a decision within the period of one month from today and the Applicant be informed within one week thereafter. The O.A. is disposed accordingly with no order as to costs. Handed.

(Rajiv Agarwal)
Vice-Chairman

prk

TRUE COPY

18/1/2017

Asstt. Registrar (Research Officer)
Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal
Mumbai