

O.A. No.494/2017 (S.B.)

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri V.A. Kulkarni, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Since last two years, no reply is filed by respondent No.2.

At the request of Ld. P.O., S.O. **two weeks** for filing reply of R.2

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.78/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri V.A. Kulkarni, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Ld. P.O. submits that the department has undertaken the process granting pay scale as asked by the applicant and he will take instructions as to within how many days grievance of the applicant will be redressed.

S.O. **two weeks** for filing reply.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.145/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A. 174/2018.**

Heard Shri A.S. Deshpande, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Ghogre, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Ld. P.O. files reply of R. 2 to 4, it is taken on record and a copy thereof is supplied to the Ld. counsel for the applicant.

S.O. **two weeks** for hearing on the C.A.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

O.A. No.159/2018

(S.B.)

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri S.N. Gaikwad, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjekar, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Ld. P.O. files reply of R. 2, it is taken on record and a copy thereof is supplied to the Ld. counsel for the applicant.

**ADMIT.**

Shri P.N. Warjekar, the learned P.O. waives notice for the respondents.

S.O. **2<sup>nd</sup> week of February 2019** for final hearing.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.273/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A.101/2018.**

There is a leave note from Shri N.R. Saboo, the Ld. counsel for the applicant. Shri P.N. Warjekar, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Application to sue jointly is allowed subject to payment of requisite court fee to be paid in the office of this Tribunal. C.A. stands disposed of.

**O.A. No.273/2018**

S.O. **four weeks** for filing reply.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.859/2018**

**(S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,**  
**Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri G.K. Iyer, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri A.P. Ponis, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

The Ld. counsel for the applicant submits that the representation filed by the applicant has been rejected and he wants to challenge the same by filing separate O.A. In view thereof, he wants to withdraw the O.A. Permission is granted for the same. O.A. stands disposed of as withdrawn with no order as to costs.

**C.A. 391/2018.**

Since the applicant wants to withdraw the O.A., C.A. has become infructuous and hence it is disposed of accordingly.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

O.A. No.155/2018 (S.B.)

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri V.A. Kulkarni, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. **four weeks** for filing reply.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.879/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri M.I. Khan, the learned P.O. for the respondent Nos.1 and 2. Shri P.V. Ghare, Adv. for R. 3 to 5.

Ld. P.O. as well as Ld. counsel for R. 3 to 5 seek time to file reply.

**S.O. four weeks.**

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.



O.A. No.911/2018 (S.B.)

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri H.K. Pande, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. **four weeks** for reply.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.923/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri P.S. Wathore, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjekar, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

The Ld. counsel for the applicant submits that he will file service affidavit within a week.

Ld. P.O. seeks time to file reply.

S.O. **four weeks.**

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.949/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri S.A. Deo, the learned C.P.O. for the respondents.

Ld. CPO submits that the application is not maintainable and he will file reply to that effect within two weeks.

**S.O. two weeks.**

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.953/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri S.A. Deo, the learned C.,P.O. for the respondent No.1.

Await service to R. 2 and 3.

Ld. CPO submitted that the applicant has challenged suspension order dated 10.4.2018. However, the said suspension has been revoked. He has filed order on record to that effect which is marked "X" for identification.

S.O. **11.1.2019** for passing necessary order.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.964/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,**  
**Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri Bharat Kulkarni, Adv.  
holding for Shri S.P. Palshikar, the  
Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri  
S.A. Deo, the learned C.P.O. for the  
respondents.

At the request of Ld. CPO, S.O.  
**four weeks** for filing reply.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.80/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri S. Chavan, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

**ADMIT.**

Shri M.I. Khan, the learned P.O. waives notice for the respondents.

S.O. **four weeks** for final hearing.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.892/2017 (S.B.)**

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri S.R. Charpe, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K. Pande, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Ld. P.O. submits that the officer who has to appear before this Tribunal is on leave due to his personal difficulty and he is coming back on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

Hence, S.O. **15.1.2019.**

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

O.A. No.929/2017 (S.B.)

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Miss Diwita Pagey, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Ghogre, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. **one week** for filing reply of respondents by Ld. P.O.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.



**O.A. No.272/2016 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,**  
**Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri P. S. Tiwari, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

Closed for orders.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.239/2016 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,**  
**Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri Bharat Kulkarni, the  
Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri  
A.P. Potnis, the learned P.O. for the  
respondents.

Closed for orders.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. Nos.798 & 799 of 2018  
(S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A.Nos. 396 & 397 of 2018.**

Heard Shri S.C. Deshmukh, the  
Ld. counsel for the applicants and  
Shri V.A. Kulkarni, the learned P.O. for  
the respondents.

2. The applicants have challenged  
their respective orders of suspension  
dated 28.9.2018. The applicants are  
Range Forest Officers. The order  
was challenged on the ground that the  
Deputy Conservator of Forests,  
Gondia has no authority to keep the  
applicants under suspension. Reply  
affidavit has been filed on behalf of  
the respondents whereby the  
respondents have justified

suspension. During the pendency of the O.As., the applicants have also filed respective applications for grant of stay or in the alternative revocation of suspension orders on the ground that no charge-sheet has been issued against the applicants in spite of lapse of 90 days from the date of suspension. Therefore, in view of the judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of **Ajay Kumar Choudhari V/s Union of India reported in (2015) 7 SCC-291 and in case of Dr. Naresh Bansal V/s State of Maharashtra and others in W.P. No.1178/2015**, suspension be revoked. The applicants have also filed representation to that effect before the competent authority on 28.12.2018. A copy of said judgment is filed today in the court which is marked "X" for identification.

3. Without going into the merits of the claim as to whether the respondent has authority to keep the applicants under suspension or not, the application can be disposed of, if

the competent authority is directed to consider the representation filed by the applicants. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that the competent authority be directed to set aside the suspension of the applicant in view of judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as the judgment passed by this Tribunal in O.A. No.918/2018 wherein directions were issued. The Ld. P.O. submits that the matter be sent back to the competent authority for deciding the representation. In view thereof, I proceed to pass the following order:-

### **ORDER**

- (i) The O.A. Nos.798 & 799 of 2018 stand disposed of with directions to the respondents to take a decision on the representation filed by the applicants dated 28.12.2018 and in view of order passed by this Tribunal in O.A. No.

35/2018 and also in O.A. No.918/2018 and the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of **Ajay Kumar Choudhari V/s Union of India reported in (2015) 7 SCC-291.**

- (ii) Decision shall be taken within **three weeks** for the date of this order and it shall be communicated to the applicant in writing.
- (iii) No order as to costs.
- (iv) Steno copies be supplied to both the parties.
- (v) C.A. Nos. 396 & 397 of 2018 also stand disposed of accordingly.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A. No.799/2018 (S.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A. 397/2018.**

Heard Shri S.C. Deshmukh, the  
Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri  
the learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.

O.A. No.742/2015 (S.B.)

**Coram: Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J)**

**Dated : 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Heard Shri D.R. Rupnarayan, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri A.P. Potnis, the learned P.O. for the respondents 1 and 2. None for R.3.

Counsel for both sides seek time to file recent recruitment rules.

S.O. **next week.**

To be treated as part heard.

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 7.1.2019.

pdg.



**O.A. No.474/2017 (D.B.)**

**Coram:Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Vice-Chairman (J) and  
Shri Shree Bhagwan,  
Member (A)**

**Dated : 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**R.A. 13/2018.**

Heard Shri A.S. Deshpande, the Ld. counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Ghogre, the learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. The applicant has filed this application for review of the judgment in O.A. No. 474/2017. The said judgment was delivered on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2018 and the O.A. was dismissed. In the said O.A., the applicant challenged the order of his dismissal from service. It was alleged that the applicant remained absent unauthorizedly for a period of 624 days and after due enquiry, he was dismissed from service. While

considering the case of the applicant, this Tribunal came to the conclusion that full opportunity was given to the applicant to defend the enquiry and the order of dismissal was maintained by this Tribunal.

3. According to the learned counsel for the applicant, this Tribunal has misinterpreted the provisions of Section 24 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 and particularly observations of this Tribunal are as under:-

“Section 25 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 does not state about initiation of departmental enquiry. It only states as to who shall issue the order of punishment and, therefore, the applicant’s contention that, the Dy. Commissioner of Police, Nagpur should not have initiated the departmental enquiry, is not correct and legal.”

4. If the applicant is aggrieved by the observation made by this Tribunal

as aforesaid, he has right to file an appeal or writ petition as the case may be before the Hon'ble High Court / Supreme Court, as the case may be. In any case, this cannot be said to be an apparent, inadvertent or typographical mistake which can be corrected in review.

5. The Ld. counsel for the applicant further submits that in the O.A., in para No. 6.4, it was stated by the applicant that the authority was bound to follow prescribed procedure as envisaged in Section 448 and 449 of Bombay Manual, 1969 Vol. as per section 26 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 and this was not referred. Even the Tribunal might not have referred Section 26 of the Bombay Police Act, 1951. There are findings in this regard in last but one para of the judgment. Section 26 of Bombay Police Act, 1951 reads as under:-

**“26. Procedure to be adopted in awarding punishment.”**

Except in cases referred to in the second proviso to clause (2)

of Article 311 of the Constitution of India, no order of punishment under sub-section (1) of Section 25 shall be passed unless the prescribed procedure is followed.”

6. In the present case, it has been observed in the judgment that the applicant was supplied with documents on which the departmental wanted to rely. Even though the applicant sought some documents in the departmental enquiry, he could not mention about its relevancy. The Tribunal observed that even otherwise number of notices were given to the applicant to defend the enquiry and still he chose to remain absent. Thus, there is a sufficient discussion on Section 26 of the Bombay Police Act, 1951.

7. It is further stated by the learned counsel for the applicant that, the Tribunal has mentioned that the applicant suppressed the fact of filing of appeal against the impugned order and its dismissal. But it is submitted that there was no malafide intention

on the part of the applicant to suppress this fact. Question of malafide intention will not arise, as fact remains that it was suppressed by the applicant.

8. Considering the aforesaid aspect, we are satisfied that this is not a fit case which can be said to fall within the ambit of review. There seems to be no apparent mistake or typographical error so as to correct the judgment. Hence, the following order:-

**ORDER**

Review Application stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

Member (A)

Vice-Chairman(J)

Dt. 9.1.2019.

pdg.

**O.A.No.581/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri Vishal Anand, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, the Id. P.O. for the Respondents.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that reply of respondent no. 3 will suffice the matter. **S.O. two weeks as a last chance.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.582/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri R.V.Shiralkar holding for Shri S.P.Palshikar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, the Id. P.O. for the Respondents.

The Id. P.O. filed the reply on behalf of the respondent no. 2. It is taken on record. Copy is served to the other side.

The matter is **admitted** and kept for final hearing.

The Id. P.O. waives notice for the respondents.

**S.O. in due course.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.582/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri R.V.Shiralkar holding for Shri S.P.Palshikar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, the Id. P.O. for the Respondents.

The Id. P.O. filed the reply on behalf of the respondent no. 2. It is taken on record. Copy is served to the other side.

The matter is **admitted** and kept for final hearing.

The Id. P.O. waives notice for the respondents.

**S.O. in due course.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.



**O.A.No.791/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A.NO.04/2019:-**

Shri R.V.Shiralkar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 to 3. None for the respondent nos. 4 & 5.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant moved an amendment application. Office is directed to put civil application number and the same is allowed. The Id. Counsel for the applicant is directed to do the necessary amendment within a week time.

**S.O. two weeks.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.929/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

None for the applicant. Shri  
A.M.Khadatkar, the Id. P.O. for the State.

Notice has not been served to the  
respondent no. 2.

**S.O. two weeks.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.408/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri A.M.Sudame, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M.Khadatkar, the Id. P.O. for the Respondents.

The Id. P.O. submits that reply is ready. However, he requires certain time to file it on record. The Id. P.O. is directed to supply the copy of the same reply to the Id. Counsel for the applicant. So, if he desires, he will file the rejoinder on next date.

**S.O. 15/01/2019.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.110/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri A.S.Nikose, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M.Khadatkar, the Id. P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 to 4. None for the respondent nos. 5 & 6.

The Id. P.O. filed the reply on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 to 3. It is taken on record. Copy is served to the other side.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that he has already filed the rejoinder on 17/12/2018.

**S.O. two weeks for final hearing.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.893/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri S.G.Jagtap, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A.Deo, the Id. C.P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 to 4 and Ms. Tiwari, the Id. Counsel for the respondent nos. 5 to 8.

During last hearing on 19/12/2018, a detailed observations was made and in last para, the Id. P.O. was directed to submit a common certificate that candidate promoted vide impugned order were not given benefit of G.R. No. chh h h 2001@1887@i z d z 64@01@16&c] f n u k d 25-05-2004 as per P.B., Pg. No. 81 (Annexure-R-2).

The Id. C.P.O. submits that reply is ready and they finalize that kind of certificate. However, it takes time to put on record. At his request, **S.O. 17/01/2019.**

*Interim relief is continued till next date of hearing. Put up this matter along with the O.A. No. 932/2018.*

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**

aps.

**O.A.No.932/2018. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri S.C.Deshmukh, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A.Deo, the Id. C.P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 & 2 and Shri K.A.Mishra holding for Shri S.R.Bhongade, the Id. Counsel for the respondent nos. 3 to 6.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant filed the Rejoinder. It is taken on record. Copy is served to the other side.

The Id. P.O. submits that there is no candidate in the impugned order who had taken benefit of the G.R. No. ~~chil h h 2001@1887@i z d z 64@01@16&c] f n u k d 25@05@2004]~~ at P.B., Pg. No. 81 (Anneuxure-R-2) in O.A.No.893/2018. However, the Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that there are two candidates who had taken benefits of the above same G.R. and he has pointed it in his Rejoinder.

The Id. P.O. further submits that they will examine the benefits in the Rejoinder and file the detail chart in the next hearing.

**S.O. 17/01/2019.**

*Put up this matter along with the O.A. No. 893/2018.*

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**

aps.

**O.A.No.105/2016. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**C.A. NO. 297/2018:-**

Shri G.R.Sadar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I.Khan, the Id. P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 & 2 and Shri R.V.Shiralkar holding for Shri S.P.Palshikar, the Id. Counsel for the respondent no. 3.

At the request of Id. Counsel for the respondent no. 3, **S.O. 14/01/2019.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.



**O.A.No.410/2017. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri V.R.Borkar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, the Id. P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 to 3. None for the respondent nos. 4 & 5.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant has submitted a letter from the Government bearing No. , e- vk; , l 1317@izdz545@ilsy&4] fnukd 14-12-2018- As per the directions in order dated 04/12/2018 in para no. 2 of the said order. It reads as under:-

“; kckcr uem dj.; kr ; rrsdh] ‘AkyS f’A{A.A o fdMk foHAKxIP; k fnukd 30-04-2005 jkstIP; k ‘AKI u fu.Az ke/; s xqAoRrk /Akjd [AGMmuk xqAoRre/; s l v ns; kph rjrm ukgh- R; keGs Jh l gSA dVjs; kulk ‘AkyS f’A{A.A o fdMk foHAKxIP; k fnukd 30-04-2005 P; k ‘AKI u fu.Az kJo; s HAJrh ifdz e/; s ik= djrk ; sAkj ukgh- R; k vuqAakusek-U; k; kf/Adj.Akr l knj djko; IP; k ‘Ai FAi =kr ueq djkos’

The Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that he will file some more documents on record, after obtaining it from R.T.I.

**S.O. three weeks.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.561/2015. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri D.C.R.Mishra, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N.Warkurkar, the Id. P.O. for the Respondents.

At the request of Id. Counsel for the applicant, **S.O. 17/01/2019.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.

**O.A.No.938/2017. (D.B.)**

**Coram: Shri Shree Bhagwan, Member(A)**  
**Dated : 07<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

Shri M.Rajkondwar, the Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, the Id. P.O. for the Respondent nos. 1 to 3. None for the respondent no. 4.

The Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that the second enquiry has been started. The Id. P.O. has been pointed out that second enquiry is as per the D.E. However, first enquiry was as per the women cell and we don't interfere in that.

However, in order dated 05/12/2017, in para no. 2 interim relief was granted till filing of the reply. **The same is continued till final outcome of the O.A..**

The matter is kept for final hearing.

The Id. P.O. waives notice for the respondents.

**S.O. two weeks.**

**Member(A)**

**Date:-07/01/2019.**  
aps.