

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

Date : 03.03.2015.

**M.A.No.23 of 2016 in M.A.No.22 of 2014
in O.A.No.39 of 2014 with M.A.No.654 of
2014 in O.A.No.39 of 2014**

1. Heard Shri M.G. Sawardekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms. N.G. Gohad, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. I have perused my order of 8.12.2015 in M.A.No. 654 of 2014 whereby the M.A. 22 of 2014 was restored to file. By this M.A.No.23 of 2016 the said restored M.A. is being sought to be amended by effecting correction with regard to extent of delay.

3. Hearing rival submission I am of the view that this M.A. can be allowed because in any case when the M.A. for restoration of the O.A. is heard. Respondents will get an opportunity to place their side before the bench. This M.A.No.23 of 2016 for amending to M.A.No.22 of 2016 is therefore allowed.

4. The amendment be carried out forthwith. Consolidated copy be filed on or before next date and copy be furnished to the learned P.O. M.A.No.22 of 2016 be appeared on 18.03.2016.

5. S.O. to 18.03.2016.

DATE: 3/3/16

CORAM:

Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)

Hon'ble Shri M. Rameshkumar (Member) ^{R.B. Malik}

APPEARANCE:

Shri. Shri. M. G. Sawardekar

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. : N.G. Gohad


C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondent/s

Order passed in Tribunal's

Adj. To: order column.

M.A. 23/16 is allowed.

M.A. 22/2016 S.O. to 18/3/16.


(R.B. Malik)
Member(J)

THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

C.A.NO.101 OF 2014 IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.476 OF 2012 (D.B.)

Shri V.V. Rane ...Applicant

Versus

Shri Sanjay Kumar ...Respondent

APPEARANCE : Shri V.V. Rane, Applicant in person.

Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondent.


CORAM : JUSTICE SHRI A.H. JOSHI, CHAIRMAN

DATE : 03.03.2016.

ORDER

1. Heard Dr. V.V. Rane, Applicant in person and Shri K.B. Bhise, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondent.
2. Party in person Dr. V.V. Rane states that his claim for fixing date of increment on previous post / scale is not given by the respondent according to his entitlement.
3. Applicant was called to show from any application, affidavit, etc. that this claim was raised by him at any point of time.
4. Party in person states that today he did not bring the required documents for substantiating his demands which are non-fulfilled so far, though those are very well included in the order passed in the O.A., by necessary implication.
5. This C.A. is proceeding like an execution application. Be it so, as it is, however it is expected that all demands of applicant, which remain unfulfilled and hence Contempt, ought to be listed in one application so that the list of un-complied demands ought not escalate like an open ended list.

6. It has to be noted by applicant that the Respondent is always taken by surprise if every time a fresh demand is raised, however genuine the demand may be, but the matter cannot be left uncertain.
7. Therefore, the Applicant is directed either to show from the record specific non-compliance on the part of the Respondent or enlist those once again preferably by way of an application.
8. For enabling the Applicant to pin-point his grievance by enlisting unfulfilled demands, hearing his adjourned to 28.03.2016.
9. Steno copy and hamdast is allowed to both sides.


(A.H. Joshi,
Chairman

prk