

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 11674 OF 2015

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS
VERSUS
PURUSHOTTAM MURHARIRAO AUSEKAR AND ANOTHERS

...
AGP for Petitioners : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar
Advocate for Respondent no.1 : Mr. S.D. Joshi
Advocate for Respondent no.2 : Mr. Dhongade Suresh D.

...
CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & P.R. BORA, JJ.

Dated: February 29, 2016

...
PER COURT :-

Heard.

2. The learned Tribunal, while considering the points raised in Original Application before it, has considered the relevant rules including the limitation for filing the revision. To that effect, there is discussion in para 19 of the impugned judgment. We respectfully agree with the view taken by the Tribunal on the point of delay.

3. In para 20 to 24 of the impugned judgment, there is discussion about delay and merits. Keeping in view the material brought before us, we are unable to persuade ourself to take different view than taken by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal. The view taken by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal is not only possible view but, is in consonance with the material placed on record by the parties before it.

4. For the reasons aforesaid, the Petition stands rejected.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

(S.S. SHINDE, J.)

...