

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 98 OF 2018

S. B. More & Ors.

)Applicants

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

)Respondents

Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, Advocate for Applicant

Ms S. P. Manchekar, Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents

CORAM : SHRI B. P. PATIL, MEMBER (J)

DATE : 05.02.2018

ORDER

1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms S. P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. Learned Advocate for the applicants submits that similarly situated persons have filed O.A. No. 61/2018 before this Tribunal and this Tribunal has granted interim relief in their favour on 19.01.2018, On the grounds that those applicants were appointed after following due selection process and continued on fixed tenure and the order of status quo has been passed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 14371/2017 on 19.12.2017 in relation to the candidates who belongs to same class / category. He has submitted that the case of the present applicants are similar to those petitioner in O.A.No. 61/2018. Hence, it is necessary to grant the interim protection to them.
3. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that the Applicant No.10 has been discontinued from the service w.e.f. 25.01.2018. Therefore, the similar relief can be granted to him also.
4. Learned C.P.O. for the respondents submitted that the respondents want to file detailed reply in the O.A. Learned C.P.O. for the respondents seeks two weeks time to file reply.

BoM

5. Considering the facts in the matter, it is crystal clear that the applicants were appointed after following due selection process and continued for fixed tenure. The applicants except applicant no.10 are continued in services. Applicant no.10 has been discontinued from the service w.e.f. 26.1.2018.

6. Considering the fact it is just to protect the services of the applicant by granting interim relief in terms of relief granted to the similarly situated persons in O.A. No. 61/2018. Therefore, the applicants' services shall be continued until next date.

7. Issue notice before admission returnable on 01.03.2018.

8. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.

9. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A.. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.

10. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

11. The service may be done by Hand delivery, speed post, courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

12. In case notice is not collected within three days or service report on affidavit is not filed 3 days before returnable date, Original Application shall stand dismissed without reference to Tribunal and papers be consigned to record

13. S.O. to 01.03.2018.

Sd/-

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

Vsm

MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.105 OF 2018

R. N. Guderiya

)Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

)Respondents

Shri A. J. ^RUniyal, Id. Advocate for Applicant

Ms S. P. Manchekar, Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents

CORAM : SHRI B. P. PATIL, MEMBER (J)

DATE : 05.02.2018

ORDER

1. Heard Shri A. J. Uniyal, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms S. P. Manchekar, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. In this Original Application, the applicant has challenged the communication dated 08.12.2008 and 30.10.2017 issued by respondent no.1, thereby informing that the posts of Sweeper have been lapsed and therefore, services of the applicant cannot be continued.
3. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits that the applicant has been appointed as a Sweeper in the year 1997 on a contract basis and his services are continued thereafter. Learned Advocate for the applicant has further submitted that as the applicant's services has not been regularized and he is not made permanent, he filed ULP Compliant No.181/2014 before the Industrial Court, Thane. It was allowed on 21.12.2016 and the respondents were directed to send the proposal to the Government to restore the post of Sweeper on the establishment of the Respondent No.1 and to grant benefits of permanency to the applicant. Thereafter, the Respondent No.3 has challenged the said order by filing W.P. No. 11201/2017 before the Hon'ble High Court. It was disposed of on 06.11.2017 as the Government

30/1

had declined to sanction/restore the post by its communication dated 30.10.2017. The applicant has filed another W.P. No.13640/2017 before the Single Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay challenging the order passed in W.P. No. 11201/2017 on 06.11.2017. It was disposed of on 20.12.2017. Thereafter the applicant filed W.P. No. 147/2018 before the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court at Bombay and it was disposed of on 09.01.2018. In W.P. No. 147/2018, the Hon'ble High Court permitted the petitioner to approach the alternate forum and seek appropriate orders. Hence the applicant has filed this O.A. and challenged the communication dated 08.12.2008 and 30.10.2017. Learned Advocate for the applicant has submitted that an interim protection was granted to the applicant by the Hon'ble High Court for a period of 30 days from the date of order dated 09.01.2018. He has submitted that as the applicant is serving as Sweeper since the year 1997 continually. The learned Advocate for the applicant has further argued that the Government has restored one post of Sweeper at Pune in the year 2009 but the Government has not considered the said aspect and wrongly rejected the proposal of the applicant by communication dated 30.10.2017. In these circumstances, it is just to grant interim relief to the applicant.

4. Learned C.P.O. has submitted that as per the Government policy posts of Sweepers have been abolished and, therefore, the proposal sent by the respondent no.2 has been declined/rejected by the government. She has submitted that in view of this fact, it is not a fit case to grant interim relief to the applicant.

5. On perusal of the record, it is clear that the applicant is serving as a Sweeper on the contract basis since the year 1997. His services are continued till today in view of the order passed by the Industrial Court as well as by the Hon'ble High Court. In these circumstances, in my opinion, prima-facie it is a fit case to grant interim relief to the applicant in terms of prayer clause 16(a) till filing of the reply by the respondents.

10/1

"16(a) That pending and final hearing of this Application, this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to protect the services of the Applicant by directing the Respondents not to terminate the services of this Applicant and further continue to pay the Applicant wages as per Minimum Wages Act."

6. Accordingly, interim relief is granted till filing of the reply by the respondents.
7. Issue notice before admission returnable on 20.02.2018.
8. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
9. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A.. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
10. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.
11. The service may be done by Hand delivery, speed post, courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.
12. In case notice is not collected within three days or service report on affidavit is not filed 3 days before returnable date, Original Application shall stand dismissed without reference to Tribunal and papers be consigned to record
13. S.O. to 20.02.2018.

Sd/-

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

Vsm

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

M.A./R.A./C.A. No.


of 20

I N

Original Application No.

of 20

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
<p>DATE : 5/2/18</p> <p>CORAM : B.P. Patil (Cm-J) Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)</p> <p>APPEARANCE:</p> <p>Shri/Smt. : A.V. Bandiwadekar Advocate for the Applicant</p> <p>Shri/Smt. : S.P. Manchekar C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondents</p> <p>Adj./S.O. to : Head order passed in tribunal column. MA is allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"></p>	<p>Date : 05.02.2018</p> <p>M.A. No. 56 of 2018 in O.A.No.98 of 2018</p> <p>S. B. More & Ors.Applicants</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.</p> <p>1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicants and Ms S. P. Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.</p> <p>2. This MA has been filed to sue jointly. As all the Applicants are seeking similar relief, the MA to sue jointly is allowed, subject to payment of Court Fees, if not already paid.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (B.P. PATIL) MEMBER (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">VSM</p>

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____ DISTRICT _____
..... Applicant/s

(Advocate

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders Date : 05.02.2018
---	---

O.A.No.866 of 2017

S. R. ZagadeApplicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.

1. Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms S. Suryawanshi, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Affidavit-in-Rejoinder is filed by the applicant. The Original Application is admitted and kept for final hearing on 12.03.2018.

3. S.O. to 12.03.2018.

Sd/-

**(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)**

DATE : 5/2/18

CORAM :
Hon'ble Justice Shri A. H. Joshi (Chairman)
B. P. Patil (M.J.)

APPEARANCE:
Shri/Smt. : A. V. Bandiwadekar
Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. : S. Suryawanshi
C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondent/s

Adj./S.O. to 12/3/18
order passed
Tribunal Column
admit
rejoinder filed by [Signature]
ref. no 1.

VSM

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

DISTRICT _____

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 05.02.2018

O. A. No.94 of 2018

A. S. JakkanawarApplicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.

1. Heard Shri M. D. Lonkar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. For making submission on the point of limitation, S.O. to 12.02.2018.

Sd/-

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

VSM

DATE: 5/2/18

CORAM:

~~Ben'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL~~
~~(Vice - Chairman)~~

Ben'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member) J.

APPEARANCE:

Shri/Smt. M. D. Lonkar

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. A. T. Chougule

C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondents

Adj. To S.O. to 12/2/18

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

DISTRICT _____

..... Applicant/s

(Advocate.....)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

..... Respondent/s

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Date : 05.02.2018

O.A.No.815 of 2017

S. M. PatilApplicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents.

1. Heard Shri R. M. Kolge, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Ms S. Suryawanshi, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Original Application is admitted and kept for final hearing on 12.03.2018.

3. S.O. to 12.03.2018.

Sd/-

(B.P. PATIL)
MEMBER (J)

VSM

DATE: 5/2/18

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri. RAJIV AGARWAL
(Vice - Chairman)

Hon'ble Shri R. B. MALIK (Member)

APPEARANCE: B.P. Patil

Shri/Smt. P.M. Kolge

Advocate for the Applicant

Shri/Smt. Ms. S. Suryawanshi

C.P.O/P.O. for the Respondents

O.A. is admitted.

Adj. To S.O. to 12/3/18.

Rejoinder. filed
by Applicant.

[Signature]

**THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI**

MA.59/18 In

MA disposed off - Chavrey or 5/2/18
DISTRICT

Original Application No. 977 of 20 17

The state of maharashtra Applicant/s
(org. resp)

(Advocate) Mrs. Archana Kolotgi (P.O.)

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

Mrs. V.N. Pondkule

..... Respondent/s
(org. appl)

(Presenting Officer.....)

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

Tribunal's orders

DATE: 5/2/18

CORAM:

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

APPEARANCE:

Shri Archana B/C P.O.
(Att - Pet.)

Shri M.D. Louker Adv.

Att - Resp for the Respondent's (Att - Applicant)

Adj.S.O. to Heard

order passed in
Tribunal column
MA is disposed

2

Learned P.O submits apart from the
averments contained in MA that the WP
would be filed within weeks.

In view of statement of learned P.O.
time fixed in para 24 of the order
passed in OA 977/2017 is enlarged
till 20/2/2018.
MA is disposed.

Sd/-
[Signature]
5/2/2018.

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

Tribunal's orders

Date : 05.02.2018.

O.A.No.1180 of 2017

A.K. Shaikh.

....Applicant.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.....Respondents.

1. Heard Shri A.K. Sutar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

2. Issue notice before admission made returnable on 02.04.2018.

3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.

4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation/notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A.. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.

5. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

6. The service may be done by Hand delivery, speed post, courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

7. In case notice is not collected within seven days or service report on affidavit is not filed three days before returnable date, Original Application shall stand dismissed without reference to Tribunal and papers be consigned to record.

8. S.O. to 02.04.2018.

Sd/-

(A.H. Joshi J.)
Chairman

prk

DATE : 5/4/18

CORAM :

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

APPEARANCE:

Shri/Smt. : D. N. Sutar.

Advocate for the Applicant

Smt. : Archana B.K.

Compl. for the Respondent/s

Aug. 2018 : 21/4/18

Heard
order passed in
Tribunal Col. 444 -
SON 21/4/18

e

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.102 OF 2018

C.N. Shirsat.

....Applicant.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.....Respondents.


Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicants.

Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

CORAM : Justice Shri A.H. Joshi, Chairman

DATE : 05.02.2018.


ORDER


1. Heard Shri A.V. Bandiwadekar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Smt. Archana B.K., the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.
2. Issue notice before admission made returnable on ~~17.02.2018~~ ^{28/2/2018}. 
3. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
4. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation / notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A.. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
5. This intimation/notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.
6. The service may be done by Hand delivery, speed post, courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

7. In case notice is not collected within three days or service report on affidavit is not filed three days before returnable date, Original Applications shall stand dismissed without reference to Tribunal and papers be consigned to record.
8. Heard on Interim relief. Perused the Preliminary Enquiry report furnished by Shri Jalsing B. Valvi, District Supply Officer, (Respondent No.4).
9. Prima facie, applicant is shown to be responsible due to failure on his part to point out the deficiency. Hence, applicant has made out case for grant of interim relief.
10. In view of the foregoing, ex-parte ad interim relief by way of stay of suspension order in terms of prayer clause 10(a) is granted, which reads as under :-
 - "a] Pending the hearing and final disposal of this O.A., this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to stay the implementation of the order dated 16.12.2017 passed by the Respondent No.1 and accordingly the Petitioner be allowed to continue to work as was before the impugned order of suspension was passed by the Respondent No.1"

(Quoted from page 30 of O.A. paper book.)
11. Steno copy and Hamdast is allowed to both parties.
12. S.O. to 28.02.2018.

prk


Sd/-
(A.H. Joshi, J.)
Chairman



D:\PRK\2018\02 FED\05.02\O.A.102-18.doc

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.110 OF 2018

DISTRICT : MUMBAI

Mrs. Meena B. Sonawane.

)...Applicant

Versus

1. The M.P.S.C. & Anr.

)...Respondents

Mr. R. Sorankar, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. K.B. Bhise holding for Ms. S.T. Suryawanshi,
Presenting Officer for Respondents.

PER : SHRI B.P. PATIL (MEMBER-J)

DATE : 05.02.2018

ORDER

1. Heard Mr. R. Sorankar, the learned Advocate for the Applicant and Mr. K.B. Bhise holding for Ms. S.T. Suryawanshi, the learned Presenting Officer for the

701P

Respondents.

2. The Applicant has challenged the recruitment process for the appointment of Nursing Superintendent Group 'A' started by the Maharashtra Public Service Commission (M.P.S.C.) by filing the present Original Application (O.A.).

3. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is M.Sc. and having Diploma in Master's Degree in Nursing. She has experience as a Professor at the College of Nursing for more than three years. He has submitted that the Applicant has fulfilled the required educational qualification and experience as mentioned in the Advertisement issued by Respondent No.1. Hence, she was eligible to be appointed on the said post. He has submitted that as per the information received by the Applicant, in all 20 candidates have applied for the said post, but the Respondent No.1 had called only five candidates for oral interview and not called the Applicant and others for interview scheduled at 9.45 a.m. today without assigning reasons. He has submitted that the candidates called for the interview were having less educational qualification and experience than the Applicant and others. No just reasons have been given by the Respondent No.1 for not calling the Applicant for oral interview. He has submitted that the interview of five candidates were conducted by the MPSC today in the morning as per the letter. He has submitted that, if the recruitment process is completed without giving

Body
-

opportunity to the Applicant to appear for the interview, then injustice will be caused to the Applicant, and therefore, he prayed to grant interim relief as prayed for.

4. The learned Presenting Officer (P.O) has submitted that he has not received any instructions from the MPSC, and therefore, he seeks time to file reply by taking instructions from the MPSC.

5. On perusal of the record, it reveals that the minimum qualification for the appointment on the post of Nursing Superintendent as mentioned in the Advertisement is that the candidate must be qualified Nurses and Midwives registered with the Maharashtra Nursing Council and possessing experience as Matron for ten years of which not less than five years should be in hospital attached to a Medical College OR possess the Ph.D. Degree in Nursing or a Master's degree in Nursing or an equivalent qualification of a statutory University and experience as Principal/Professor at a College of Nursing for not less than three years and experience as ward sister or a higher post in a teaching hospital for not less than two years.

6. On going through the documents on record, it reveals that the Applicant has completed the post graduation in Nursing i.e. M.Sc. Nursing. She has experience of three years on the post of Professor at the time of filing of the application.

BM

Prima-facie, it seems that the Applicant is eligible candidate for the post of Nursing Superintendent. According to the Applicant, the candidate No.1 viz. Sontakke Arjun Vithal and Kolte Narendra Jagannath are not qualified candidates, as they are not having required experience of the post of Professor.

7. On perusal of the letter dated 3rd February, 2018 received to the Applicant from MPSC, it reveals that the MPSC had not called the Applicant considering the educational qualification and experience and accordingly, her objection to the candidature of Mrs. Chate, Sonatakke and Kolte has been rejected. In all five candidates had been called for oral interview today and the interview had been conducted at 9.45 a.m. as per the schedule (Page No.65). The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the interviews are still going on and the same are under process.

8. In these circumstances, in my opinion, it is just to direct the Respondent No.1 to keep the result of the oral interview in a sealed envelope and not to declare it until filing of the reply by the Respondents.

9. The learned Advocate for the Applicant seeks leave to amend the O.A. and to add the name of the candidates, who have been called for oral interview as Respondents. Leave granted. The Applicant to carry out amendment within one week.

BM

10. Issue notice to the Respondents returnable on 26th February, 2018.
11. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal shall not be issued.
12. Applicant is authorized and directed to serve on Respondents intimation / notice of date of hearing duly authenticated by Registry, along with complete paper book of O.A. Respondents are put to notice that the case would be taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission hearing.
13. This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1988 and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.
14. The service may be done by Hand Delivery / Speed Post / Courier and acknowledgement be obtained and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within one week. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.
15. In case, notice is not collected within three days or service report on affidavit is not filed 3 days before returnable date, Original Application shall stand dismissed without reference to Tribunal and papers be consigned to record.

ROM

16. S.O. to 26th February, 2018. Hamdast.

Sd/-
(B.P. Patil)
Member-J
05.02.2018

Mumbai

Date : 05.02.2018

Dictation taken by :

S.K. Wamanse.

D:\SANJAY WAMANSE\JUDGMENTS\2018\2 February, 2018\O.A.110.18.w.2.2018.doc

IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL MUMBAI

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. _____ of 20 _____

IN

Original Application No. _____ of 20 _____

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearance, Tribunal's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Tribunal's orders
<p>DATE: <u>5/2/18</u></p> <p>CORAM: <u>B.P. Patil, Member (J)</u> Hon'ble Shri. <u>RAJIV AGARWAL</u> (Vice - Chairman) Hon'ble Shri <u>R. D. MALIK</u> (Member) A <u>P.N. Dixit</u></p> <p>APPEARANCE: <u>Applicant In person</u> Advocate for the Applicant <u>Shri/Smt. A.J. Chougule</u> C.P.O./P.O. for the Respondents</p> <p><u>Adj. To. 50. to 20/2/18.</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>O.A.953/2016</u></p> <p>Shri S.S. Kamble ... Applicant Vs. The State of Mah. & ors. ... Respondents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heard Applicant in person and Shri A.J. Chougule, the learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents. 2. The learned P.O. submitted that he has received the requisition from the Applicant and the concerned Officer is going to submit the copies as claimed by the Applicant in the afternoon. The learned P.O. has further submitted that the Applicant will have to be asked to verify the documents with the original and then to collect it and submit the report to the Tribunal today only. Therefore, he seeks time. 3. The Applicant has submitted that he will collect the copies of the documents from the Respondents. He further submits that he intends to amend prayer clause in the O.A, and therefore, he sought time. 4. In view of the submissions made by the Applicant and the learned P.O, two weeks' time is granted. 5. S.O. to 20th February, 2018. <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (P.N. Dixit) Member-A 05.02.2018</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- (B.P. Patil) Member-J 05.02.2018</p>