

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 4497 OF 2016
WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 4498 OF 2016

Smt.Ashwini Ashok Kshirsagar. ... Petitioner.
V/s.
The Inspector General of Registration and
Controller of Stamps (MS), Pune and another. ... Respondents.

Siddharth R. Ronghe for the petitioner.
A.I.Patel, AGP for the respondents.

**CORAM : D.H.WAGHELA, C.J. AND
M.S.SONAK, J.**

DATE : 20th April 2016.

P.C. :

The petitioner has sought to challenge the judgment dated 25th February 2016 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai in Original Application Nos.934/2015 and 935/2015 wherein the gist of the matter is recorded and it is observed as under:

“7. It is seen that the Applicant has not filed any affidavit-in-rejoinder denying these contentions. However, to be fair to her, she has made alternate prayer that both the D.E.'s may be completed against her within a stipulated time. We are inclined to accept the alternated prayer of the

applicant in both the O.A.s. As in the affidavit-in-reply filed on 01.01.2016, the Respondents have indicated that report of the E.O. Will be received in 4 months. Thereafter, it should be possible for the Respondents to complete the D.E. In all respect within a further period of 2 months. We, therefore, direct the Respondents to complete both the D.E.'s in all respects before 30.06.2016. No further time will be granted to complete D.E.'s after that. Needless to say that the Applicant will fully cooperate in completion of the D.E.'s and, if any, delay in completion of D.E.'s is found attributable to her, the time to complete D.E.'s will get extended by that period.”

2. It would clearly appear from the above findings that the matter of departmental enquiry against the petitioner has already been prolonged and it is at the option of the petitioner that all process has been expedited so as to relieve the parties of the pendency of the departmental enquiry. No error much less any error apparent on the face of record is pointed out in arriving at the conclusion as aforesaid. Hence, there is no justification for this Court to exercise its extra ordinary jurisdiction to interfere with the process of departmental action. Accordingly, both petitions are summarily dismissed.

(M.S.SONAK, J.)

CHIEF JUSTICE