

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 8418 OF 2016

Nanda d/o Madhavrao Thote

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
& others

Respondents

Mr. S.V. Mundhe, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Joshi, A.G.P. for respondents 1 to 3.

Mr. R.B. Narwade, advocate for respondent no. 4.

Mr. M.P. Kale, advocate for respondent no. 5.

CORAM : R.M.BORDE &

SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, JJ.

DATE : 19th DECEMBER, 2017

PER COURT:

1. Petitioner is objecting to the order passed by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal in Original Application no. 174/2016 decided on 29.07.2016.

2. Though the petitioner was party to the proceedings, she contends that she has not received notice and the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal has erroneously recorded in the order that in spite of service of notice she has failed to appear before the Tribunal. Petitioner contends that she is resident of Pimpalgaon, Tq. Palam, Dist. Parbhani whereas in the original application her address is shown as Anand nagar, Purna, Tq. Purna, Dist. Parbhani. It is the contention of petitioner that her husband resides at Purna.

3. It is not clarified in the petition as to whether husband of petitioner has received notice on her behalf. Apart from this, on perusal of Adhar Card as well as Voters Identity Card, photostat copies of which are annexed to the petition, it does appear that petitioner is resident of Anand nagar, Purna i.e. the address recorded in the original application. The contention raised by petitioner in the instant petition prima facie appears to be misleading. In exercise of extra ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, no interference is called for in the instant petition. Petition is devoid of substance hence stands rejected.

SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI
JUDGE

R.M.BORDE
JUDGE

dyb