

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**NAGPUR BENCH NAGPUR****ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.957/2023(S.B.)**

Aba S/o Murari Bagde
Aged 58 Years, Occ. Service,
R/O. Behind Police Line, Ward No.6 Wani,
Tahsil Wani, District Yavatmal,
Pin No.445304.

Applicant.

Versus

- 1) State of Maharashtra,
Department of Home,
Through It's Secretary,
Mantralaya Annexe Mumbai 400032.
- 2) The Inspector General of Police,
Maharashtra State,
Maharashtra Rajya Police Mukhyalaya,
Shahidbhagat Singh Marg, Colaba, Mumbai 400039.
- 3) Superintendent Of Police,
Yavatmal Near LIC Square, Yavatmal-445001.

Respondents

Shri S.G.Zinjarde, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.
Shri V.A.Kulkarni, Ld. P.O. for the respondents.

Coram:- Hon'ble Shri M.A.Lovekar, Member (J).

Dated: - 30th August, 2024.

JUDGMENT

Judgment is reserved on 07th August, 2024.

Judgment is pronounced on 30th August, 2024.

Heard Shri S.G.Zinjarde, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri V.A.Kulkarni, learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. Case of the applicant is as follows. The applicant is working as Part Time Sweeper at Wani Police Station since 01.06.1997. His work has been satisfactory throughout. Recommendations were made to make him permanent. His representation for redressal of this grievance was forwarded to respondent no.3. The grievance was, however, not redressed. The applicant had presented his grievance before Labour Officer, Yavatmal (Annexure A-6) but he did not prosecute it as the said authority lacked jurisdiction to grant him appropriate relief. On 17.01.2023 the applicant made a representation (Annexure A-9) to respondent no.3 but to no avail. He was getting salary of Rs.140 per month. It was increased to Rs.450/- per month. Presently he is getting salary of Rs.5,252/- per month. He has so far rendered continuous

service of more than 27 years. Hence, it be declared that the applicant is entitled to be regularised with consequential benefits.

3. Stand of respondent no.3 is that there is no procedure for regularising services of Part Time Employees and employees appointed on purely temporary or contract basis.

4. In support of his case the applicant has not placed on record either any G.R. or authoritative pronouncement. Relief of declaration of permanency sought from this Tribunal is misconceived. Hence, the O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(M.A.Lovekar)
Member (J)

Dated – 30/08/2024.
rsm.

I affirm that the contents of the PDF file order are word to word same as per original Judgment.

Name of Steno : Raksha Shashikant Mankawde.
Court Name : Court of Hon'ble Member (J).
Judgment signed on : 30/08/2024.
and pronounced on
Uploaded on : 30/08/2024.