



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

WRIT PETITION NO.8511 OF 2024

Smt. Archana w/o Shailendra Gaikwad,
Age : 51 years, Occu.: Service as RTO, Pune,
R/o.: A-301, Opula 24-K, Vishal Nagar,
Pimple- Nilakh, Pune 411 027,
Cell : 7738900057

.... **PETITIONER**

VERSUS

1. Shri Shyam s/o Shivajirao Lohi,
Age : 49 years, Occu.: Service (as RTO)
R/o.: Flat No. 303, Angeera Woods,
Near Mehrun Lake, Lake City, Jalgan
2. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Additional Chief Secretary,
Home (Transport) Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai – 400 032
3. The Transport Commissioner,
Maharashtra State, 5th Floor,
Telecom Bhawan, Fountain,
MTNL Bldg. No.2, Fort,
Mumbai – 400 001

.... **RESPONDENTS**

.....
Mr. R. N. Dhorde, Senior Counsel a/w Mr. P. S. Dighe i/be Mr. Ajay
S. Deshpande and Abhay D. Ostwal, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Rajendrraa Deshmukh, Senior Counsel a/w Mr. Kunal Kale i/b
Mr. Avinash Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.1
Mr. A. S. Shinde, AGP, for Respondent Nos.2 & 3 -State

.....

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9474 OF 2024

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through the Additional Chief Secretary,
Home (Transport), Department Mantralaya,
Mumbai
2. The Transport Commissioner,

Maharashtra State, 5th Floor,
Telecom Bhavan, Fountain,
MTNL Bld. No. 2, Fort,
Mumbai – 400 001.

.... **PETITIONERS**
(Orig. Resp. Nos.1 & 2 in O.A.)

VERSUS

1. Shri Shyam Shivajirao Lohi,
Age ; 49 years, Occu.: Service as RTO,
R/o.: Flat No. 303, Angeera Woods,
Near Mehrun Lake, Lake City, Jalgaon.

2. Smt. Archana w/o Shailendra Gaikwad,
Age : 51 years, Occu.: Service as RTO, Pune,
R/o.: A-301, Opula 24K, Vishal Nagar,
Pimple Nilakh, Pune – 411 027

.... **RESPONDENTS**
(Orig. Applicant in A.O.)

....

Mr. A. S. Shinde, AGP for the Petitioners-State
Mr. Rajendrraa Deshmukh, Senior Counsel a/w Mr. Kunal Kale i/b
Mr. Avinash Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.1
Mr. R. N. Dhorde, Senior Counsel a/w Mr. P. S. Dighe i/be Mr. Ajay
S. Deshpande and Abhay D. Ostwal, Advocate for Respondent No.2

....

**CORAM : S. G. MEHARE AND
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.**

**RESERVED ON : 11/03/2025
PRONOUNCED ON : 18/03/2025**

JUDGMENT : (Per : Sandipkumar C. More)

1. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the rival parties.

2. The subject matter under challenge in both these writ petitions, is the order dated 30/07/2024 in Original Application

No.600 of 2024 passed by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai Bench at Aurangabad (hereinafter referred to as 'the learned Tribunal'). The learned Tribunal under the impugned order has quashed and set aside Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 issued by respondent No.2-State in Writ Petition N.8511 of 2024 under which modification in the posting on promotion given to the petitioner in the same petition i.e. Smt. Archana Shailendra Gaikwad affecting the earlier promotional posting granted to the present respondent No.1 – Shri Shyam Shivajirao Lohi in this petition. It is to be noted that under Writ Petition N.9474 of 2024 the State through Additional Chief Secretary, Home (Transport) Department Mantralaya, Mumbai, has also challenged the same judgment and order passed by the learned Tribunal. Thus, both petitions are for quashing the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 under which the petitioner – Archana has been posted as a RTO Group-A at Pune, whereas respondent Shyam Lohi is posted at Chandrapur as a RTO Group-A. To avoid ambiguity, the parties are referred to by their names.

3. Background facts are as under :

Petitioner – Archana joined the service as a Assistant RTO after her selection through MPSC on 04/09/2002. Subsequently on 26/08/2015 she was promoted as a Deputy RTO and in the month of June, 2018 she was posted at Akaluj, District Solapur as a Deputy RTO. While in service, the petitioner – Archana had made several representations / applications to the Principal Secretary with request that she be posted at Pune or nearby place like Pimpri-Chinchwad due to health issue of her husband as well as ailments of her mother aged about 78 years. Additionally, she personally visited the Principal Secretary and requested for such posting. However, earlier Principal Secretary got transferred on 26/02/2024 and in his place a new officer joined. On 28/02/2024 the petitioner – Archana again made a fresh application before new Principal Secretary for the same request. However, in the first week of March, the preparation for Lok-Sabha elections was going on. On 16/03/2024, the State issued a Government Resolution whereby in all 23 Deputy RTO were temporarily promoted as RTO Group-A and they were given postings to the respective places as mentioned in the said Government Resolution. As per the said Government Resolution, Shyam Lohi was given promotional posting at Pune District. Despite issuance of said Government Resolution, the said order of promotion and posting was not implemented due

to Code of Conduct on account of Lok-Sabha elections. As such, the petitioner - Archana remained at Akaluj on her earlier posting and was a Nodal officer at Solapur District for poling which took place on 07/05/2024, 13/05/2024 and 20/05/2024. After poling was over, the petitioner - Archana again visited the Joint Secretary and reminded him about her pending applications since 2020 and also the recent application dated 28/02/2024 requesting for posting her at Pune on account of medical treatment of her husband and her mother. Thereafter, on 13/06/2024 the State Government and Competent Authority considered the request of the petitioner - Archana and by issuing the impugned Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 and modified the places of promotional postings of the petitioner - Archana as well as the respondent - Shyam Lohi. Accordingly, the petitioner - Archana was posted at Pune as a RTO Pune whereas the respondent - Shyam Lohi was posted as a RTO Chandrapur. The petitioner - Archana as per the said Government Resolution joined her post at Pune on 14/06/2024. However, feeling dissatisfied with the said Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 the respondent - Shyam Lohi filed Original Application No.600 of 2024 before the learned Tribunal and accordingly the learned Tribunal under the impugned judgment and order quashed the Government Resolution

dated 13/06/2024 and directed State Government and the Transport Commissioner to implement the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 to the extent of promotional postings of the petitioner – Archana as well as the respondent – Shyam Lohi. Hence, these petitions.

4. The learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde for the petitioner – Archana vehemently submitted that the respondent / State has rightly considered the applications of the petitioner- Archana on account of illness of her husband and mother and modified the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 by giving her posting at Pune as requested by her. According to him, there was no necessity of giving reason by the State in the subsequent Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024. The learned Tribunal definitely erred in observing that for such modification there was no proposal from the Civil Service Board. He added that in case of promotional posting, no such proposal from Civil Service Board was in fact required and it was clearly pointed out by the petitioner – Archana in her reply affidavit.

5. The learned AGP while arguing on the writ petition filed by the State, also supported the submissions made by the learned

senior counsel Mr. Dhorde and reiterated that there is no statutory provision which has laid down a specific procedure which is to be followed for effecting posting on promotion. The learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde as well as learned AGP vehemently argued that the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 was not published or implemented and therefore, the observation of the learned Tribunal that no opportunity was given to the respondent – Shyam Lohi or there was need for certain statutory provision for making modification in the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 by the subsequent Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024.

6. The learned AGP by placing reliance on the Government Resolution dated 31/01/2014 issued by General Administration Department, submitted that even if any promotional posting is to be given to the candidate or person, the final authority for such promotional posting is the Competent Authority of State as mentioned in the said Government Resolution specially under clause 3.7. Thus, the learned AGP as well as the learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde prayed for setting aside the impugned judgment and order of the learned Tribunal. The learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde relied on following citations.

- A) *Mrs. Shilpi Bose and others vs. State of Bihar and aothers, AIR 1991 SC 532;***
- B) *Union of India and others vs. S.L. Abbas, AIR 1993 SC 2444;***
- C) *Sk. Nausad Rahaman and others vs. Union of India and others, (2022) 12 SCC 1;***
- D) *Rajendra Singh and others vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others, (2009) 15 SCC 178;***
- E) *The State of Maharashtra and another vs. Omprakash Ghanshyamdas Mudiraj and another, 2009(2) AIR Bom R 22 (DB);***
- F) *V. B. Gadekar vs. Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority and another, 2008(2) Mh.L.J.;***
- G) *State of Maharashtra and others vs. Deepak Bubudas Vaishnav, 2010 SCC OnLine Bom 1491;***
- H) *State of Maharashtra vs. Ashok Ramchandra Kore and another, 2009(4) Mh.L.J. 163;***
- I) *S. C. Saxena vs. Union of India and others, (2006) 9 SCC 583;***
- J) *Ashok Laxman Gaikwad vs. State of Maharashtra, (2006) 9 SCC 587 ;***
- K) *Amarjeet Singh and others vs. Devi Ratan and others, (2010)1 SCC 417 and***

L) *Edukanti Kistamma (dead) through LRs. and others vs. S. Venkatareddy (dead) through LRs. and others, (2010) 1 SCC 756.*

The learned AGP also placed reliance on the following judgments.

- A) *Pubi Lombi vs. State of Arunachal Pradesh and others, 2024 SCC OnLine 279;***
- B) *Union of India and others vs. S. L. Abbas, (1993) 4 SCC 357 &***
- C) *N. K. Singh vs. Union of India and others, (1994) 6 SCC 98.***

7. On the contrary, the learned senior counsel Mr. Deshmukh arguing on behalf of the respondent – Shyam Lohi strongly supported the impugned judgment and order. According to him, the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 was in fact published and it was duly communicated to the persons mentioned therein. According to him, as per the said Government Resolution the respective postings were already given to the officers mentioned therein except the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi, on 06/06/2024 itself. He further pointed out that the petitioner – Archana must have influenced the concerned authority in between 06/06/2024 and 13/06/2024 by illegal means and got her posting modified. Further, the learned senior counsel Mr.

Deshmukh vehemently argued that the entire process carried out by the State Government in modifying the places of postings of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi was highly suspicious and without any opportunity of being heard to the respondent – Shyam Lohi. He pointed out that even the learned Tribunal had directed the State Government to produce record in respect of procedure adopted for such modification, but the State Government withheld the said record for the reason best known to it. Thus, he claimed that the modification order was arbitrary and the learned Tribunal has rightly set aside the same. In support of his submissions, he relied on following citations.

- A) *Smita Shrivastava vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh and others, arising out of SLP© No(s).23966-23968 of 2022, decided on 03/05/2024;***
- B) *Manoj Kumar vs. Union of India and others, in Civil Appeal No. 2679 of 2024, arising out of SLP © NO.5278 of 2019, decided on 20/02/2024;***
- C) *Jayrajbhai Jayantibhai Patel vs. Anilbhai Jayantibhai Patel and others, 2006 DGLS (SC) 745;***

- D) *Asha Sharma vs. Chandigarh Administration and others, 2011 DGLS (SC) 698;***
- E) *L. Chandra Kumar vs. Union of India and others, (1997) 3 SCC 261;***
- F) *T.S.R. Subramanian vs. Union of India and others, 2014(1) AIR Bom R 110 &***
- G) *Syed Yakoob vs. K. S. Radhkrishnan, 1964 AIR(SC) 477.***

8. Heard rival submissions. Also perused the entire documents on record alongwith the impugned judgment and order.

9. On going through the impugned judgment passed by the learned Tribunal, it reveals that the learned Tribunal has set aside the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 in respect of modification mainly on the grounds that the representations made by the petitioner – Archana since 2020 till 28/02/2024 might have been considered by the Competent Authority and thereafter, posted her to Chandrapur under the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 and that the Competent Authority failed to give reasons as to why there was subsequent modification only in respect of postings given to the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi. The learned Tribunal has also held that

the Government Resolution of modification was arbitrary and issued under probable influence by the petitioner – Archana.

10. According to the petitioner – Archana, the Competent Authority - State considered her difficulty in a proper sense and in view of illness of her husband and mother, rightly modified the earlier Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 and posted her at Pune. According to her, no proposal from Civil Service Board, was in fact required for such subsequent modification. Further, as per the learned AGP, who has also challenged the Government Resolution of modification, there was no statutory provision laid down to adopt a specific procedure for causing any modification in respect of posting on promotion and therefore, as per the earlier Government Resolution dated 31/01/2014 Competent Authority of State was very much empowered to effect the modification. The learned AGP as well as the learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde both submitted that no mandatory rule was violated by such modification as it was done by the Competent Authority considering the representations of the petitioner – Archana. According to both of them, while effecting such modification, there was no *mala fide* intention on the part of the Competent Authority

and thus, the scope of judicial review in this matter is not available.

11. In the back drop of these submissions, various citations relied upon by the learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde can be gone into. In case of ***Mrs. Shilpi Bose and others*** (*supra*), it has been observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court that transfers made by the Competent Authority on request of servants without violating any mandatory rule, cannot be interfered with by the High Court. Further in the case of ***Union of India and others vs. S. L. Abbas*** (*supra*), it has been observed that order of transfer made without following guidelines, cannot be interfered with by court unless it is vitiated by *mala fide* or is made in violation of statutory provision. Further in the case of ***Sk. Nausad Rahman and others*** (*supra*), it has been observed that 'transfer' being condition of service, it is within powers of employer to take policy decision and power of judicial review cannot be exercised to interfere with such policy decision. In the case of ***Rajendra Singh and others*** (*supra*), the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that it is an exclusive prerogative of the State Government as to where the employee should be transferred and in absence of any *mala fides* there shall be no interference of Courts. However, these observations have come in

the cases of transfer whereas we are dealing the issue of allotting place of posting. Therefore, these observations specially made by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as this court dealing with the cases of transfer, are not helpful.

12. The learned AGP also relied on certain observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court. However, on going through the said observations in the judgments relied by the learned AGP, they are also in respect of transfer cases. However, in case of ***Union of India vs. S. L. Abbas*** (*supra*), the scope of judicial review is clarified and it has been observed that such review is permissible only when there is a clear violation of the statutory provision or the transfer is persuaded by *mala fide*. Here in this case, we are dealing with the issue of modification in the earlier places of posting of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi. The learned Tribunal has set aside such modification mainly by observing that it is arbitrary and passed without assigning any reason. Admittedly, the chronology of the facts is to be considered to ascertain whether there was influence on the part of the petitioner – Archana to cause such modification.

13. From the impugned judgment, it reveals that on 16/03/2024 the Competent Authority of State issued Government Resolution in respect of assigning promotional post to 23 Deputy RTOs in Group-A to the post of RTO Group-A. The record shows that the petitioner – Archana was definitely junior to the respondent – Shyam Lohi in the said list. Though it is disputed that whether the said Government Resolution was published on the website of Government, but it is not in dispute that immediately after said Government Resolution was issued, Code of Conduct was declared by the Election Commission of India and therefore, the earlier postings of the aforesaid 23 officers remained ineffective. However, it is extremely important to note that on 06/06/2024 most of the officers promoted vide Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024, were relieved from their earlier posts for joining their new postings i.e. after the end of Code of Conduct. It is only in respect of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi subsequent modification under Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 was issued wherein their respective places of postings as mentioned in Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 were interchanged.

14. Admittedly, various representations were made by the petitioner – Archana since 2020 till 28/02/2024 with the

Competent Authority with a request to place her either at Pune or Pimpri-Chinchwad considering illness of her husband and mother. It is to be noted that last representation was made by her on 28/02/2024. Though there was dispute between the parties whether the said Government Resolution was really made, but by presuming that it was made by the petitioner – Archana, the Competent Authority issued Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 by placing her at Chandrapur. Thus, an inference can safely be drawn that even after her representations till 28/02/2024 the Competent Authority of State posted her at Chandrapur. This fact clearly indicates that the Competent Authority must have considered her earlier representations but still chose to post her at Chandrapur and not at Pune or Pimpri-Chinchwad. Further, it is extremely important to note that other officers from Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 were given postings after the Code of Conduct on 06/06/2024 to respective places as mentioned in Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024. Therefore, it is inexplicable on the part of the Competent Authority of State as to why the places of postings of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi were interchanged under the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 within only six or seven days. On bare perusal of the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 it is

clearly evident that no reason is mentioned for such modification therein.

15. The learned senior counsel Mr. Deshmukh for the respondent – Shyam Lohi has supported the impugned judgment mainly on the ground of arbitrariness. He has relied on various citations as mentioned above, wherein it has been observed that judicial review is very much available if it is found that any order is made arbitrarily and without following any proper procedure. Even if we hold that there was no specific procedure for the impugned modification laid down, but from the circumstances on record the arbitrary nature of such modification can be ascertained.

16. The Competent Authority of State has supported the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024 on the ground that it was final authority as per clause 3.7 of the Government Resolution dated 31/01/2014 and therefore, the respondent – Shyam Lohi could not challenge the same. However, it appears that the learned Tribunal has relied on the observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of ***Jayrajbhai Jayantibhai Patel vs. Anilbhai Jayantibhai Patel and others, 2006 (8) SCC 200 & Asha Sharma vs. Chandigarh Administration and others, 2011***

DGLS (SC) 698. The learned Tribunal has made special reference in respect of observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Asha Sharma** (*supra*). According to which whether the process of decision making is valid, but proper reasons are not recorded for arriving at a conclusion, the action may still fall in the category of arbitrariness. Here in this case though the Competent Authority under the modification has taken a decision for placing the petitioner – Archana at Pune, but no reasoning is there on record. It is extremely important to note that the respondent – Shyam Lohi had also filed an application under Right to Information Act from the State for getting reasons for such modification. However, despite asking for such documents, the State did not provide the same to him. It has been opined by the learned Tribunal that the respondent State at their own must have produced the said documents on record and non-production of such documents would lead to an adverse inference and it can be treated as one more circumstance against the State.

17. In the case of **Smita Shrivastava** (*supra*) the Hon'ble Apex Court while setting aside the order of State Government and its officials has made observation that as a consequence, they are of the firm view that the appellant deserves a direction for restitutive

relief with compensation for the misery piled upon her owing to the arbitrary and high-handed action of the State Government and its officials. On going through the aforesaid citation the Hon'ble Apex Court had set aside order of the State Government by specially observing that even the concerned High Court in refusing relief of appointment to the appellant on the post of Samvida Shala Shikshak Grade-III despite holding that denial of such appointment was grossly illegal and arbitrary.

18. In the case of **Manoj Kumar** (*supra*), the Hon'ble Apex Court has made following observations:

“11. Analysis : The standard argument made consistently and successfully before the Single Judge and Division Bench must fail before us. Clauses 14 and 19 of the vacancy circular do nothing more than reserving flexibility in the selection process. They cannot be read to invest the Institute with unbridled discretion to pick and choose candidates by supplying new criteria to the prescribed qualification. This is a classic case of arbitrary action. The submission based on Clauses 14 and 19 must fail here and now.”

Further, at the cost of repetition, observation fo the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jayrajbhai Jayantibhai Patel** (*supra*) can be reproduced as below :

“18. *Having regard to it all, it is manifest that the power of judicial review may not be exercised unless the administrative decision is illogical or suffers from procedural impropriety or it shocks the conscience of the court in the sense that it is in defiance of logic or moral standards but no standardised formula, universally applicable to all cases, can be evolved. Each case has to be considered on its own facts, depending upon the authority that exercises the power, the source, the nature or scope of power and the indelible effects it generates in the operation of law or affects the individual or society. Though judicial restraint, albeit self recognised, is the order fo the day, yet an administrative decision or action which is based on wholly irrelevant considerations or material; or excludes from consideration the relevant material; or it is so absurd that no reasonable person could have arrived at it on the given material, may be struck down. In other words, when a Court is satisfied that there is an abuse or misuse of power, and its jurisdiction is invoked, it is incumbent on the Court to intervene. It is nevertheless, trite that*

the scope of judicial review is limited to the deficiency in the decision-making process and not the decision.”

19. Further, the learned Tribunal has also relied upon the judgment in the case of **Asha Sharma** (*supra*), wherein it is clearly observed that judicial intervention is very much required when any order passed without assigning any reason and arbitrarily.

20. If the instant case is scrutinized by applying instances of arbitrariness as mentioned above, then it appears that though under Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 the places of postings of 23 Deputy RTOs Group-A were determined, but not implemented immediately due to Code of Conduct. Further, it is evident that when the Code of Conduct was over, the remaining officers were given postings on 06/06/2024 and just six or seven days thereafter the postings of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi, were interchanged under the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024. It is highly inexplicable that even after considering her representations till 28/02/2024, the petitioner – Archana was posted at Chandrapur under the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 and then what was the special occasion for the Competent Authority of the

State to change her posting from Chandrapur to Pune by sending the respondent – Shyam Lohi to Chandrapur. Moreover, the Competent Authority has also not given a single line reason for effecting such modification in the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024. Therefore, the observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court in respect of arbitrariness as mentioned above, are squarely applicable to the present case also as the Competent Authority of the State has miserably failed to assign any reason as to why they caused modification of the Government Resolution dated 16/03/2024 by interchanging the places of postings of the petitioner – Archana and the respondent – Shyam Lohi by issuing another Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024. The learned Tribunal has therefore, rightly observed that there was requirement of judicial review in respect of impugned Government Resolution dated 13/06/2024. Considering all these aspects, we find no reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Tribunal. Accordingly, both the writ petitions stand dismissed and disposed of. Rule stands discharged accordingly. Interim relief if granted earlier, shall stand vacated.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

21. After pronouncement of the judgment, the learned senior counsel Mr. R. N. Dhorde requested for stay of execution of the judgment passed by the learned Tribunal. The learned counsel for respondent No.1 Mr. Deshmukh strongly opposed the request made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner on the ground that respondent No.1 has not joined the posting at Chandrapur. Further, he pointed out that this court did not stay the effect of judgment of the learned Tribunal. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner - Archana has already taken charge of her posting at Pune on 14/06/2024. Further, it is also pertinent to note that the learned Tribunal after passing the judgment had stayed the same to enable the petitioner - Archana to challenge the same. The learned senior counsel Mr. Dhorde submits that he would challenge the judgment passed by this court before the Hon'ble Apex Court. The learned counsel Mr. Deshmukh for respondent submits that due to order dated 12/08/2024 of this court for maintaining status on that day, respondent No.1 could not join and he is without salary since last nine months.

22. Considering the fact that the learned Tribunal had stayed its own order and also considering the fact that the petitioner - Archana has already joined her posting at Pune, the stay granted

by the learned Tribunal, is extended for further period of four weeks. It is made clear that no further extension will be granted.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

VS Maind/-