

O.A. No. 278/2016 .

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.

DATE : 25/11/2016.

The learned counsel for the applicant is stated to be out of station. Hence, adjournment is sought.

Smt. S.V. Kolhe, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 and 2. Shri S.N. Gaikwad, Adv. for R.3..

S.O. two weeks.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 267/2015.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.

DATE : 25/11/2016.

Smt. K.N. Saboo, learned counsel
for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjekar,
Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O. four weeks for filing reply
at the request of learned P.O.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 640/2015.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.

DATE : 25th November 2016.

Oral order

None for the applicant. Smt. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for the respondents.

2. On the earlier three dates, none appeared for the applicant. On the last date, it was adjourned with a view to afford one more opportunity and it was observed that the O.A. will be dismissed on the next date. Accordingly, the O.A. was reflected on today's board for dismissal. Despite of this, none appeared for the applicant.

3. The learned P.O. submits that the applicant is a married daughter of deceased employee and seeking appointment on compassionate ground. Applicant's brother was appointed on compassionate ground as a legal heir of deceased employee i.e. Waman. However, he did not join. As per G.R. dated 26.2.2013, t he

married daughter can get appointment, if family of the deceased is depending on her. It is submitted that in the above state of affairs, the applicant cannot get appointment.

4. Since none appears for the applicant, O.A. is dismissed.

Later on

Shri N.M. Jibhkate, learned counsel for the applicant appeared and submits that he was busy in the High Court and hence could not appear when the matter was called out. The learned counsel for the applicant filed a G.R. dated 17.11.2016 wherein the married daughter is also shown to have been entitled for appointment on compassionate ground.. Therefore, he requests to restore the O.A.

2. The learned P.O. objected on the ground that the G.R. is recently issued and cannot have retrospective effect etc. All these aspects can be considered on merit.

3. In the interest of justice, since the learned counsel for the applicant appeared today itself, order passed

dismissing the O.A. is recalled and the O.A. is restored to file.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant wants to amend the prayer clause and challenge the orders of recovering the claim.

S.O. **two weeks**.

Vice-Chairman

Pdg

O.A. No. 823/2015.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.
MCA No. 61/2016.

Shri R.S. Nagpure, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.A. Barabde, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The O.A. came to be dismissed for default on 24.8.2016. For the reasons given in the MCA, it allowed. O.A. is restored to file.

O.A. No. 823/2015.

O.A. is restored to file consequent to the order in MCA No. 61/2016 passed today i.e. on 25.11.2016.

At the request of learned counsel for the applicant, S.O. **next week.**

Vice-Chairman

Pdg

O.A. (St.) No. 1488/2016.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.
C.A. No. 374/2016.

Shri G.G. Bade, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sainis, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. has filed reply on behalf of R.3 and 4. It is taken on record and a copy thereof is supplied to the learned counsel for the applicant.

The employee has some vision problem. He took voluntary retirement on 31.10.2010. Thereafter the employee died on 10.6.2014. His widow has applied for release of pensionary benefits and family pension etc. In view of this factual aspect, delay deserved to be

condoned. Consequently the O.A. is allowed.

O.A. (St.) No. 1488/2016.

Heard both sides.

2. Issue notice before admission to R. 2 to 6 returnable in **one week.**
3. Shri S.A. Sainis, learned P.O. waives notice for respondent No.1. Hamdast granted.
4. Tribunal may take the case for final disposal at this stage and separate notice for final disposal need not be issued.
5. 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
6. This intimation / notice is ordered under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunals (Procedure) Rules,1988, and the questions such as limitation and alternate remedy are kept open.

7. The service may be done by hand delivery, speed post or courier and acknowledgement be obtained

and produced along with affidavit of compliance in the Registry within three weeks. Applicant is directed to file Affidavit of compliance and notice.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 826/2015.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri S.R. Renu, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjekar, learned P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of learned P.O.,
S.O. **three weeks for filing reply.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 21/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri G.G. Bade, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sainis, learned P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of learned P.O.,
S.O. **three weeks for filing reply.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 222/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri G.K. Bhusari, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A.P. Potnis, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. has filed submissions of the respondents. Same are taken on record. Copies are served to the learned counsel for the applicant.

The learned counsel for the applicant is filling his power today itself in this matter in addition to present Advocates.

At his request, S.O. **two weeks.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 228/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Mrs. K.N. Saboo, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Khadatkar, learned P.O. for the respondents 1 and 2. None for R.3.

At the request of P.O., S.O.
four weeks.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 361/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri P.V. Thakre, Adv. holding for Shri Bharat Kulkarni, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri V.A. Kulkarni, learned P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of P.O., S.O. **two weeks for reply by way of peremptory chance.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 435/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri P.V. Thakre, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjekar, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. has filed reply on behalf of R. 1 & 3. Same is taken on record. Copy thereof is served to the learned counsel for the applicant.

S.O. **two weeks.**

Vice-Chairman

O.A. No. 487/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

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

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

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 507/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

None for the applicant. Shri A.M. Khadatkar, learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. **two weeks.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 538/2016.

**CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.
DATE : 25th November 2016.**

Shri G.G. Bade, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. has filed reply on behalf of R. 6 i.e. District Malaria Officer, Gondia. Same is taken on record. Copy thereof is served to the learned counsel for the applicant.

At the request of learned P.O.,
S.O. **four weeks for reply of R.1.**

Vice-Chairman

O.A. No. 591/2016.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.

DATE : 25th November 2016.

Shri G.K. Bhusari, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Deo, learned C.P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of learned C.P.O.,
S.O. **four weeks for reply.**

Vice-Chairman

Pdg

O.A. No. 671/2016.

CORAM : S.S. Hingne : Vice-Chairman.

DATE : 25th November 2016.

Shri G.K. Bhusari, Adv. holding for Shri Bharat Kulkarni, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A.P. Potnis, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. has filed communication dated 24.11.2016, wherein it is mentioned that by the end of this month necessary order can be issued.

S.O.two weeks for disposal.

Vice-Chairman

O.A. No. 673/2016.

Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.
C.A. No.486/2016.

Heard Shri G.K. Bhusari, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Deo, learned C.P.O. for the respondent No.1. Shri Amit Kukde, Adv. for R.2. None for R.3.

The learned C.P.O. has filed an order dated 18.11.2016. The applicant has challenged the order dated 4.10.2016 by which he was transferred from Pulgaon to Gadchiroli. By the recent order dated 18.11.2016, now he has joined at Yavatmal. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the grievance of the applicant is redressed. Hence, the O.A. is disposed of. With this the C.A. also stands disposed of.

Vice-Chairman

Pdg

O.A. No. 679,,680,681,682 & 683 of 2016.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

Heard Shri S.N. Gaikwad,
learned counsel for the applicants and
Shri M.I. Khan, learned P.O. for the
respondents.

ADMIT.

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

Heading expedited.

At the request of P.O., S.O.

29.11.2016.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 671/2015.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

None for the applicant. Mrs. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. two weeks.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 161/2008.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

Shri Gulhane, Adv. holding for
Shri V.A. Kothale, learned counsel for
the applicant and Mrs. M.A. Barabde,
learned P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of P.O., S.O.

5.12.2016.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 801, 826 & 848 of 2012.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

None for the applicant. Mrs. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for the respondents.

S.O. two weeks.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 759/2015.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

Shri N.D. Thombre, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, learned P.O. for the respondents.

The learned counsel for the applicant wants to give details in the tabular form showing excess payment which is sought to be recovered vide prayer clause (iii).

S.O. two weeks.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 656/2015.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

Mrs. Smita Dashputre, Adv. holding for Shri P.B. Patil, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for the respondents 1 to 3 and 5. None for R.4.

At the request of learned counsel for the applicant, S.O. **one week for disposal by way of peremptory chance.**

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. No. 522/2016.

**Coram: S.S.Hingne:Vice-Chairman.
Dated 25th November 2016.**

ORDER.

Heard Shri M.I. Mourya,
learned counsel for the applicant and
Smt. S.V. Kolhe, learned P.O. for
the respondents.

2. The applicant has
challenged the transfer order of June
2015 by filing O.A. No. 271/2015
which was rejected on 14.7.2015.
Thereafter the applicant carried the
matter up to the Honourable Apex
Court of the land. But to no effect.

3. The transfer of the
applicant was on mainly two grounds:
(i) criminal case was registered

against him and (ii) his behaviour was not proper.

4. The applicant has challenged the criminal case registered against him before the Honourable High Court and the Honourable High Court has quashed the F.I.R. against the applicant on 13.10.2015.

5. Armed with the order of quashing the F.I.R., the applicant made representation on 13.2.2016 to the respondents to transfer him on the earlier post i.e. in Traffic Branch as Head Constable. The representation is not yet decided.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that since F.I.R. is quashed and the transfer was mainly on the allegations in the F.I.R. which is quashed, now he be posted in the Traffic Branch, because so far as

other allegations are concerned, there are no such complaints with the department, the applicant learnt it from the copy taken under the Right to Information Act to that effect.

7. The learned P.O. submits that the transfer was not only on the ground of registration of criminal offence, but several other grounds including behaviour of the applicant with the staff and public etc.

8. In the above state of affairs, the respondent No.2 i.e. the Commissioner of Police, Nagpur City to decide the representation of the applicant dated 13.2.2016 before 31st December 2016, considering all these aspects.

9. S.O. first week of January, 2017.

10. Steno copy be provided
to the learned P.O.

Vice-Chairman

pdg

O.A. 382/2013 & 88/2015

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Shri Sagar Katkar, Id. counsel holding
for Shri N.R. Saboo, Id. counsel for the
applicants and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the
respondents.

At the request of Id. counsel for the
applicants, **S.O. Next week.**

Put up along with O.A.167/2015.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 713/2015

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Shri Sandip Tatke, Id. counsel holding for Shri V.B. Bhise, Id. counsel for the applicant, Shri A.M.Ghogre, Id. P.O. for R-1&2, Shri Sagar Katkar, Id. counsel holding for Shri N.R. Saboo, Id. counsel for R-3 and Shri D.U. Thakare, Id. counsel holding for Shri N.S. Warulkar, Id. counsel for R-4.

At the request of Id. counsel for the applicant, **S.O. one week.**

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 242/2016 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Shri D.U.Thakre, Id. counsel holding for Shri N.S. Warulkar, Id. counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K.Pande, Id. counsel for R-1 to 3. None for R-4&5.

Learned counsel submits that Shri N.S.Warulkar, Id. Counsel for the applicant is out of station.

At the request of Id. counsel for the applicant, **S.O. one weeks for disposal** as the grievance of the applicant is redressed.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 518/2010 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Shri M.V. Joshi, Id. Counsel holding for Shri P.S. Wathore, Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the Respts.

At the request of Id. Counsel for the applicant, S.O.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 603/2016 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Shri S.C. Deshmukh, Id. Counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Deo, Id. CPO for R-1&2. None for R-3.

At the request of Id. CPO, S.O. two weeks for reply of R-1 by way of last chance.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 453/2010 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

None for the applicant. Shri H.K. Pande, Id. P.O. for R-1 to 4. None for R-5&6.

S.O.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 480/2010 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

None for the applicant. Shri S.A. Sainis, Id. P.O. for the Respts.

S.O.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 498/2010 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

None for the applicant. Shri H.K. Pande, Id. P.O. for the Respts.

At the request of Id. P.O., **S.O. two weeks for reply.**

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 520/2010 (D.B.)

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

None for the applicant. Shri H.K. Pande, Id. P.O. for the Respts.

At the request of Id. P.O., **S.O.**

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. 629/2016 **(D.B.)**

Coram : Hon. Shri S.S. Hingne, V.C.

Dated : 25.11.2016.

Heard Shri S.G.Ramteke, Id. Counsel for the applicants and Shri Khadatkar, Id. P.O. for the Respts.

The learned P.O. submits that the O.A. can be disposed of since the applicants

are appointed till 30-04-2017. The learned counsel for the applicant accedes the same. Accordingly the O.A. is disposed of.

V.C.

dnk.

O.A. No.267/ 2015

Coram : S.S. Hingne : V.C.

Dated : 25th November, 2016.

Heard Smt. K.N. Saboo,
Id. Counsel for the applicant and
Shri P.N. Warjurkar, Id. P.O. for the
respondents.

The applicant sought the interim relief on the ground that the same is extended to the other employees on the basis of the orders passed in W.Ps and O.As. The applicant has relied on the bunch of Wps. filed before the Hon'ble High Court and the order passed therein on 13/1/2015 so also filed the copy of the order dtd. 6/5/2016 passed by

this Tribunal in O.A. No. 279/2016. The applicant being similarly situated is entitled for the benefits granted in the above orders.

It is observed in the order dtd. that 6/5/2016 that there being the set of O.As seeking the same interim relief and therefore the Principal Secretary, Department of Public Health, Govt. of Maharashtra and the Directors to issue to necessary instructions to all the concerned so that the flow of litigation can be stopped. The respondents to comply the same.

S.O. 4 weeks for filing reply at the request of the Id. P.O.

Skt.

O.A. No.564 /2016

Coram : S.S. Hingne : V.C.

Dated : 25th November, 2016.

Heard Shri M.R. Rajgure,
Id. Counsel for the applicant,
Shri A.M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for R/1
and Shri Kinkhede, Adv. holding for
Shri H.D. Dangre, learned counsel for
R. 2 to 4.

2. The applicant has
challenged the transfer order dtd/
20/7/2016 and relieving order dtd.
6/8/2016.

3. The Id. P.O. and the Id.
Counsel for the R/2 to 4 submitted
that the respondents are corporation
and hence the Tribunal has no
jurisdiction. The Id. Counsel for the
applicant prayed that the respondents

be directed to file the reply. The Id. P.O. and the Id. Counsel for R/2 to 4 reiterated that they do not want to file the reply and the matter can be decided. Since the issue of jurisdiction goes to the root of the matter however being legal point it is heard and decided.

4. The Id. Counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant is a Class-I Govt. employee working as an Executive Engineer and therefore the Tribunal has the jurisdiction. The respondents' submission is that both the impugned orders are passed by the Maharashtra State Road Development Corporation Limited (herein after referred to as the MSRDCL) i.e., R/2 and 3 and for want of notification the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to deal with the aspect of Corporation.

5. No doubt that the applicant is a Govt. employee. He was transferred by Govt. of Maharashtra as an Executive Engineer, Z.P. Hingoli vide order dtd. 10/9/2015 (Anne.A-6, Page-26). While at Hingoli, the applicant made the representation dtd. 5/3/2015(Page-25) to the Secretary, Public Health Department to transfer him either at Nagpur for Bhandara for his personal difficulties. Thereon the Govt. of Maharashtra transferred the applicant on the post of Executive Engineer, MSRDC, Nagpur. Consequently the applicant joined at Nagpur under the MSRDC.

6. The MSRDC issued the order dtd. 20/7/2016 (Anne.A-1, page-16) which is impugned in this case. This order is captioned as distribution of work amongst the Engineers

working in Nagpur and Amravati Districts. The charge of the work at Nagpur which was with the applicant was withdrawn by this order and the charge of Amravati and Washim Region was given to him. This order is issued by the Chief Administrative Officer, MSRDC, Mumbai (R/3).

7. The Id. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has opted for his transfer either at Nagpur or Bhandara for his personal difficulties. However, ignoring the same the MSRDC has now transferred him to Washim. According to the Id. P.O. and the Id. Counsel for R/2 to 4 by the impugned orders the headquarter of the applicant is retained at Nagpur and therefore it is not a transfer. The applicant is relieved of the charge of

projects at Nagpur vide order dtd. 6/8/2016.

8. Nothing is placed on record to demonstrate that the Corporation cannot issue the impugned orders because the applicant is the Govt. servant. The question emerges when the applicant is working with the Corporation and the Corporation makes the internal administrative changes which relate to the applicant whether it is open for the applicant to challenge the same before this Tribunal when the Govt. has not issued the notification under Section 15(2) of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.

9. The Id. Counsel for the applicant vehemently urged that the service conditions of the applicant are affected as the applicant is a Govt. servant and therefore it is immaterial

whether the Corporation who has passed the order is notified or not for bringing it under the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The Section 15 runs as under :-

“ Jurisdiction, powers and authority of State Administrative Tribunals-

(1) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this act, the Administrative Tribunal for a State shall exercise, on and

from the appointed day, all the jurisdiction, powers and authority exercisable immediately before that day by all

courts (except the Supreme Court in relation to –

(a) recruitment and matters concerning recruitment, to any

civil service of the State or to any civil post under the State;

(b) all service matters concerning a person not being a person referred to in clause (c) of this sub-section or a member, person or civilian referred to in clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 14 appointed to any civil service of the State or any civil post under the State and pertaining to the service of such person in connection with the affairs of the State or of any local or other authority under the control of the State Government or of any corporation owned or controlled

by the State Government;

(c) all service matters pertaining to service in

connection with the affairs of the State concerning a person appointed to any service or post referred to in clause (b), being a person whose services have been placed by any such local or other authority or corporation or other body as is controlled or owned by the State Government, at the disposal of the State Government for such appointment.

(2) The State Government may, by notification, apply with effect from

such date as may be specified
in the notification the
provisions of

sub-section (3) to
local or other
authorities and
corporations
controlled or
owned by the State
Government :

PROVIDED that if the
State Government considers it
expedient so to do for the purpose
of facilitating transition to the scheme
as envisaged by this Act, different
dates may be so specified under this
sub-section in respect of different
classes of, or different categories
under any class of, local or other
authorities or corporations.

(3) Save as otherwise expressly
provided in this act, the
Administrative Tribunal for a
State shall also exercise, on
and from the date with effect
from which the provisions of this
sub-section apply to any local or

other authority or corporation, all the jurisdiction, powers and authority exercisable immediately before that date by all courts (except the Supreme Court in relation to-

(a) recruitment, and matters concerning recruitment , to any service or post in connection with the affairs of such local or other authority or corporation or society; and

(b) all service matters concerning a person other than a person referred to in clause (b) of sub-section(1) of this section or a member, person or civilian referred to in clause (b) of sub-section(1) of section 14 appointed to any service or post in

connection with the affairs of such local or other authority or corporation and pertaining to the service of such person in connection with such affairs.

(4) For the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that the

jurisdiction , powers and authority of the Administrative Tribunal for a State shall not extend to, or be exercisable in relation to, any matter in relation to which the jurisdiction, powers and authority of the Central Administrative Tribunal extends or is exercisable”.

10. From the facts of the case no doubt it is manifest that the applicant for his personal difficulties opted for transfer to Nagpur and accordingly he was transferred by the Govt. The applicant has challenged the orders issued by the Corporation.

The Govt. has not issued the notification applying the provisions of the Act to the Corporation so as to get the Tribunal jurisdiction to decide the matter.

11. The Id. Counsel for the applicant urged that directions can be issued to the Govt. of not transferring the applicant. However, that order is issued by the Corporation which is the internal administrative matter of the Corporation. In my view in the absence of the notification, the Tribunal do not get the jurisdiction to issue any direction to the Corporation. Having regard to the explicit provision, it is manifest that for want of verification the Tribunal has no jurisdiction and therefore, the O.A. is not tenable and the applicant is at liberty to take appropriate recourse .

In the result, the O.A. stands
rejected for want of jurisdiction.

V.C.

Skt.

