

O.A. No.159/2015 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

**C.A.154/2016 –**

Shri Vishal Anand, Id. counsel  
for the applicants and Smt. M.A.  
Barabde, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of Id. counsel for  
the applicants, **14-03-2017.**

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. No.117/2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

**C.A.439/2016 in C.P. (St.) 1753/16**

Shri V.A. Kothale, Id. counsel for  
the applicant and Shri V.A. Kulkarni,  
Id. P.O. for Respts.

At the request of Id. counsel for  
the applicant, **S.O. 02-03-2017.**

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. No.141/2015 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

**C.A.Nos. 06/17 & 36/17**

Heard Shri P.B. Patil, Id. counsel for the applicants, Shri P.R. Agrawal, Id. counsel for R-4 to 6, Shri A.P. Sadavarte, Id. counsel for R-7 to 10 and Shri A.M. Ghogre, Id. P.O. for R-1 to 3.

The learned counsel for the Respts. submits that in both the C.As. the copies are already served on the respective applicants and respondents and they are seeks to file reply within one week in the C.As.

**S.O. 20-02-2017** along with other connected matters.

**Member (J).**

O.A. No.718/2015 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

**C.A.No. 19/17**

Heard Shri S.K. Tambde, Id. counsel for the applicants, Shri P.R. Agrawal, Id. counsel for R-5to 7, Shri A.P. Sadavarte, Id. counsel for R-8 to 11 and Shri H.K. Pande, Id. P.O. for R-1 to 3.

The learned counsel for the R-8 to 11 submits that in the C.A. the copies are already served on the respective applicants and respondents. The respondents/ applicant seek to file reply within one week in the C.As.

**S.O. 20-02-2017** along with other connected matters.

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. No.668/2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

**C.A.No. 33/17**

Shri Bharat Kulkarni, Id. counsel for the applicants and Shri P.N. Warjurakr, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

The learned counsel for the applicants submits that the matter is covered in view of the Judgment delivered in O.A. Nos. 545, 761, 802, 805/2015 & 97/2016. In view of thereof, the matter is admitted and placed for final hearing on **15-02-2017.**

The learned P.O. waives notice for all the Respts.

**Member (J).**

O.A. No.788/2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

None for the applicant. Shri S.A. Deo, Id. CPO files reply on behalf of R-2 to counter affidavit. It is taken on record.

**S.O. 27-2-2017.**

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. No.770/2015 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

Shri V.A. Kothale, Id. counsel for the applicant and Shri P.N. Warjurkar, Id. P.O. for the R-1 & 2. None for R-3&4.

At the request of Id. counsel for the applicant, **S.O. 20-2-2017.**

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. No.90/2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

Shri V.A. Kothale, Id. counsel for  
the applicant and Smt. M.A. Barabde,  
Id. P.O. for R-1&2. None for R-3 to 7.

At the request of Id. counsel for  
the applicant, **S.O. 20-2-2017.**

**Member (J).**

dnk.



O.A. No. 377/ 2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

Shri Agrawal, Id. counsel for the applicants and Smt. M.A. Barabde, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O. 20-02-2017** along with other connected matters.

**Member (J).**

dnk.

Rev.A. 10/16 in O.A. 117/16 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

Shri V.A. Kothale, Id. counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sainis, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of Id. counsel for the applicant, **S.O. 2-3-2017** along with other connected matter.

**Member (J).**

dnk.

O.A. 307/2016 (D.B.)

**Coram : Hon. Shri J.D. Kulkarni,  
Member (J).**

**Dated : 13.02.2017.**

Shri S.N. Gaikwad, Id. counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sainis, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

The learned P.O. waives the notice of R-2 & R-3 and states that there is no need of reply of the respondent no.3 as reply of R-2 has already been filed. Since respondent no.2 has already filed reply, the matter is admitted and kept for final hearing.

Put the matter before the regular D.B. whenever is available with liberty to circulate the matter.

**Member (J).**

dnk.

**O.A. No. 07 /2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

None for the applicant. Smt. S.V. Kolhe, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 to 3. None for R/4.

See my order of 7<sup>th</sup> February, 2017. The applicant has obviously lost interest in this O.A. and the same is hereby dismissed in default with no order as to costs

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No.267/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

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

Reading of the pursis dtd.18/1/2017, the O.A. is hereby disposed of as not pressed with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No.479/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

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

See my order of 6<sup>th</sup> February, 2017. The O.A. is hereby dismissed in default and for failure to take steps with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No.515/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.S. Dhengale, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.Khadatkar, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.6.3.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. Nos. 801, 826 & 848/2005.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.A. Marathe, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A. M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of the Id. counsel for the applicant,  
**S.O.14.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.



**O.A. No. 704/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.P. Palshikar, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.20.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No.721/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

None for the applicant. Shri A.M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

At the request of Id. P.O.,  
**S.O.14.3.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 429/2016.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

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

Ld. P.O. submits a copy of the order dtd. 14/10/2016. Taken on record. It appears that the O.A. has worked itself out. The applicant apparently is not interested for which the earlier orders including my order dtd. 6/2/2017 may be perused. It is however, recorded that the dismissal for default hereof will not affect the appointment of the applicant which has already been made. With this the O.A is

dismissed for default with no order  
as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No.313/2014.**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.K. Tambde, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A. M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 & 2. None for R/3..

At the request of the Id. counsel for the applicant,  
**S.O.16.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 311/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

There is a leave note of the learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. S.V. Kolhe, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 621/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

There is a leave note of the learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sanis, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**Rev. Appn. 9/2016 in O.A. No.**

**311/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

There is a leave note of the learned counsel for the applicant. Shri A.M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 to 3. None for R/4.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.



**O.A. No. 553/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri T.S. Kene, Adv. holding for Shri A.P. Tathod, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 743/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri T.S. Kene, Adv. holding for Shri A.P. Tathod, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri S.A. Sani, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 316/2014**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri N.S. Warulkar, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A.M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents. **S.O.14.2.2017.**

P.H.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 953/2012**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

The applicant, a Lecturer in Botany having been working as such from 1986 hereby seek the relief of placement in an appropriate scale although he has mentioned it as a senior scale and seeking for fixing applicant's placement in the senior scale from 1991 as per the recommendations of the Selection Committee constituted in the year 2004.

I have perused the record and proceedings and heard Shri S.A. Marathe, Id counsel for the applicant and Smt M.A. Barabde, Id. P.O. for the respondents. It

may not be necessary for me to discuss in extend so the facts in order to determine any factor or issue. It apparent appears to be an admitted position that the applicant is still awaiting for placement in certain scale which he has prescribed as senior scale. In the affidavit-in-reply it has been mentioned that the applicant's ACR for the period from 11/9/1995 to 31/3/1996 was average and was unsatisfactory for the period from 1996 to 1997. However, Shri Marathe has taken me through the document which is at page no. 40 of the paper book and which shows that for all the latter periods the ACRS were commendable. It is not necessary to set out year wise details on that behalf. Shri Marathe, mentions the fact that for two years the respondents cited the cause was personal anomoz. I would prefer nt to examine this aspect in detail because really speaking it is not necessary to do

so. The Id. P.O. points out para 2 of paragraph 6 of the affidavit-in-reply of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent filed as far as on 18/3/2014 where it was mentioned *inter-alia* that the proposal for grant of benefit of the career advancement scheme to the applicant would be submitted before the Selection Committee constituted a per the G.R. dtd. 29/6/2009 for due consideration. It therefore quite appears that ---- the case of the applicant should be addressed. Even if the entire matter was to be heard as it commonly called merit ultimately the decision has to first up all come from the authorities and therefore in my opinion it will not be possible for this Tribunal at this stage to give any concrete direction a such. The respondents must take decision within 3 months from today with record to the service career giving him placement and also the issue of ACR which was their own showing is hanging file for more

than last 3 years. This also should be completed within 3 months from today. As the discussion is just about to complete the Id. P.O. raises of with permission raising the issue of limitation. In my opinion, the issue of limitation may not arise because of The O.A. is disposed of with these directions with no order as to cost.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 676/2014**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S. Majid, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

After hearing the matter for some time and after perusing the report of the Enquiry Officer, I accept the request of Shri Majid to consider if this O.A. should be heard along with the O.A. filed by Shri K.S. Sharma . For the present this O.A. stands adjourned to **16.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.



**O.A. No. 118/2015**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.N. Gaikwad, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt. M.A. Barabde, Id. P.O. for the respondents. The Id. counsel for the applicant seeks permission to withdraw this O.A. with liberty to file a fresh one after the decision of the departmental enquiry if need be. Leave is accordingly granted and the O.A. is allowed to be withdrawn with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 553/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri T.S. Kene, Adv. holding for Shri A.P. Tathod, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 625/2007**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Heard Shri G.N. Khanzode, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri H.K. Pande, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

The Id. counsel for the applicant files rejoinder in the Court. The same is taken on record.

**S.O.15.2.2017.**

P.H.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 681/2015**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri J.R. Kidilay, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 and 2. None for R/3 to 5. .

**S.O.6.3.2017.**

Put up with O.A.  
No.375/2016.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 725 to 727/2015**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

None for the applicant. Shri  
M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the  
respondents

**S.O.14.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 829/2014**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

A retired Range Forest Officer is agitating his claim for grant of first time bound promotion from 1/10/1994 while he has been given the same from 2/5/2000. His application came to be rejected by the order of 13/3/2013 passed by the Chief Conservator of Forests (Regional), Nagpur, Annexure-A-1, page-19 of the paper book and was confirmed in appeal by the Additional Chief Conservator of Forests by the order dtd. 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2014, Annexure-A-2, page-20 of the paper book.

2. I have perused the record and proceedings and heard Shri Swapnil Pathak, Id. counsel for the

applicant and Smt. S.V. Kolhe, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

3. It is the case of the respondents that in considering the entitlement of the applicant for time bound promotion from 1/10/1994 it was taken into consideration that during 1985 to 1999 he was placed under suspension pending prosecution under Section 279 of the Indian Penal Code. It is a common ground that the order of suspension was revoked in 1991.

4. The cause assigned for having not considered him fit for promotion in order to deal with his request for time bound promotion was that during the period of suspension his ACRs were not written and for some period subsequent to 1991 they were not up to the mark. In my opinion the whole thing is not so simple as that if there were no ACRs for the post 1985-1991 period then equal

number of ACRS for earlier period could have been taken into consideration. The adverse ACR was admittedly not communicated to the applicant and going by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Dev Dutt-vs. Union of India (2008) 8 SCC 725** and **Sukhdev Singh -vs. Union of India ( 2013) 9 SCC 566,** the Govt. could not have acted against the applicant for the uncommunicated adverse remarks. In that view of the matter therefore, in my opinion the authorities whose orders are impugned herein were not justified not were they accurate in declining to grant the applicant the time bound promotion from 1/10/1994. The Chief Conservator of Forests (Regional), Nagpur is therefore directed to reconsider the case of the applicant in the light of the observations herein made and more particularly in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Dev Dutt**



(supra ) and **Sukhdev Singh**  
(supra) and make an appropriate order with regard to grant of time bound promotion to the applicant within a period of 6 weeks from today. Both the impugned orders are therefore quashed and set aside. The O.A. is therefore allowed in these terms with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 624/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

The applicant with Shri Bharat Kulkarni, learned counsel for the applicant, Smt. M.A. Barabde, Id. P.O. for R/1 and Shri K.D. Deshpande, Id. counsel for R/2 to 4.

This is a part heard O.A. However, Mr. Kulkarni, Id. counsel for the applicant who is present just now seeks permission to withdraw the O.A. His permission is accordingly granted and the O.A. is disposed of for want of prosecution with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 339/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

The O.A. is admitted and by consent taken up for final hearing forthwith.

This O.A. is made by the retired Govt. employee seeking interest on the amounts which according to her were unreasonably delayed.

I have perused the record and proceedings and heard Shri A.C. Dharmadhikari, Id. counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

The facts insofar as they must be stated in order to resolve this controversy *inter alia* are that this applicant brought O.A. No.184/1996 ( **Smt. Sanjivani Shripad Ranade- Vs- State of Maharashtra and 3 others**). The Hon'ble Member, Judicial made an order dtd. 17<sup>th</sup> November, 1998. It may not be necessary now for the purposes hereof to set out the details from that particular order which is at Annexure-A-1, page-31 of the paper book. The entire reproduction of para 15 , page-48 of the paper book would make the whole position quite clear.

**Para 15 : " Herein this case, even duty is caste on the petitioner to approach the Court and bring to the notice of the Court that she is without job for so many years and that she be directed to be accommodated some where immediately, in the interest of all.**

***But, it appears that she also did not taken any steps by approaching the Court and thus, some fault also lies with the petitioner. Considering the facts and circumstances, I direct that the respondent-Government should treat the period between 2/9/85 to 10/3/1993 as a duty period. However, she will be entitled to half wages for this period as she did not work for this period. She will be entitled for increments, if any, during this period, H.R.A. and other admissible allowances etc. but she will not be able to claim interest thereon. The order shall be complied with within four months from the date of this order. With these directions, the petition is disposed off with no order as to costs. “***

The present respondents challenged the above order of this Tribunal in W.P. No.1439/1999 (

**The State of Maharashtra and 3 others –vs. Smt. Sanjivani Shripad Ranade**). It is a common ground that the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to grant stay to the order made by this Tribunal referred to and reproduced herein above. The copy of that stay order may not have there but as I mentioned it is a common ground that such an order of stay was granted by the Hon'ble High Court in 1999 or thereabout. A Division Bench of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court at Nagpur Bench decided that W.P. by the order dtd. 11<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2014, Annexure-A-II. The W.P. came to be dismissed with no order as to costs. The net result of the order of the Hon'ble High Court was that the order of this Tribunal was affirmed. Thereafter a lapse of some time took place and the dues were paid to the applicant. However, the applicant has made a grievance that the amount having been paid

belatedly, she could be entitled to the interest @ 18% p.a.

No doubt, the Tribunal in its order made it clear that the applicant would not be able to claim interest on the amount but that by itself can be no reason to summarily throw the O.A. out because one has to understand the case of the applicant that the amount under various heads were paid to her belatedly and Mr. Dharmadhikari, the Id counsel for the applicant told me that were that amount paid in good time to the applicant that would have yielded returned to her. She having been deprived thereof, is now entitled to be paid interest.

That is only one aspect of the matter. Another aspect of the matter is as to whether in view of the stay granted by the Hon'ble High Court, if the amounts were not paid by the respondents, could it be taken exception to. The Id.

P.O. quite understandably argued that there cannot be and he made with counter to Shri Dharmadhikari, the Id. counsel for the applicant. Mr. Dharmadhikari told me that once the W.P. was finally dismissed then the liability insofar as the respondents are concerned, would arise not from the date of the order of the Hon'ble High Court but from the date in the year 1998, the significance of which date must have become clear.

Having given careful and anxious consideration to the rival submissions, I am afraid I am unable to agree with Mr. Dharmadhikari, the Id. counsel for the applicant. It is no doubt true that the judicial order made by this Tribunal brought in its vague. A duty to be performed by the respondents and that duty was to pay the amounts under various heads as must have become clear



by the order of this Tribunal reproduced herein above. Now, if the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to grant stay, then in my view, the liability to make immediate payment pending W.P. would get affirmed as it were. It is not as if the non-payment was on account of any defiance or was in the nature of unauthorized retention. In that view of the matter, therefore, since the stay was operating, I do not think any liability could be fastened on the respondents for non-payment of the amounts under the various heads. It can by no strength of imagination be said that the respondents voluntarily and for no cause whatsoever and may be even indefinitely withheld the payment. In fact the non-payment was as a result of the order of the Hon'ble High Court staying the operation of the order of this Tribunal and therefore, I find myself unable to concur with Mr.

Dharmadhikari's submission that once the W.P. was dismissed, the liability to pay interest would arise if the amounts were not paid "immediately". In my opinion therefore, the claim for interest in obtaining set of circumstances cannot be successfully made. It appears however that the order of the Hon'ble High Court was dtd. 11/9/2014 and the Id. P.O. informs that the actual payment was made on 1/12/2015. Therefore, there was a delay of at least about 15 months. Even if it is accepted that there is inevitable delay, the whole period cannot be condoned and in my view interest at least for a period of 12 months will have to be paid. But in these set of facts, the rate of interest should be @ 12% p.a. and not 18% p.a. I therefore hold that the applicant is not entitled to the interest of the entire period post 1998 but she is entitled thereto only @ 12% p.a. for the period of 12 months. The

respondents are directed to calculate and pay to the applicant interest @ 12% p.a. on the amounts paid to her on 1/12/2015, within a period of 4 weeks from today. The O.A. is allowed only in these terms and no further with no order as to costs.

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 675/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri S.C. Deshmukh, the learned counsel for the applicant and Shri A. M. Ghogare, Id. P.O. for the respondents 1 to 3 and Shri K.D Deshpande, Id. counsel for R/4.

**S.O.17.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 553/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

Shri T.S. Kene, Adv. holding for Shri A.P. Tathod, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.

**O.A. No. 339/2016**

**Coram: R.B. Malik, Member(J)**

**Dated : 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017.**

This O.A. is made by a retired Govt. employee seeking interest on the

Heard Shri T.S. Kene, Adv. holding for Shri A.P. Tathod, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M.I. Khan, Id. P.O. for the respondents.

**S.O.27.2.2017.**

**Member (J)**

Skt.