

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.372/2012

Date of Decision: 05.10.2017.

CORAM: HON'BLE SHRI ARVIND J. ROHEE, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SHRI R. VIJAYKUMAR, MEMBER (A)

1. Shri K.M. Khopkar
 2. Shri M.N. Chimbalkar
 3. Shri R.B. Mavdikar
 4. Shri R.D. Tagade
 5. Shri R.C. Dhivar
 6. Shri J.U. Gangawane
 7. Shri M.S. Bagal
 8. Shri S.S. Tamhankar
- All 1 to 8 C/o Shri K.M. Khopkar,
137, Madhuban, Galli No.5,
Sangavi, Pune 411 027.***
9. H.D. Waghere
At & Post Pimprigaon,
Near Geeta Niwas, Pimpri,
Pune 411 017.
 10. A.L. Phutane
A-7, Sejal Park, Keshav Nagar,
Chinchwad Pune – 411 033.
 11. M.N. Jadhav
S. No. 34/1, Plot No.20,
Road No.11, Vidyanagar,
Pune 411 032.
 12. D.D. Patole
S.No. 241, Road No.14,
Behind Buddha Vihar,
Vidyanagar, Pune 411 032.
 13. Shri Ashok Dayaram Gangurde
Sairaj Residency, “Shankar Raj Park”,
B-1, Sr.No.38/1/1, Pimple Gurav,
Pune – 411 027.
 14. V.A. Kutal
Flat No.5, Krushna Appt,

Near Khosla Plastic Company,
Bopodi Chowk, Bopodi,
Pune 411 003.

... ***Applicants***

***All the applicants are working at
Controller CQA, Khadkee, Pune – 3.
(Advocate Shri N.G. Helekar)***

Versus

1. Union of India, through
Ministry of Defence,
Through Secretary, South Block,
New Delhi – 1.
2. Department of Personnel & Training,
Through Secretary, New Delhi,
South Block, New Delhi – 1.
3. Director General (Quality Assurance)
(Armaments) D.H.Q.,
New Delhi. Room No.234,
South Block, New Delhi.

4. Controller C.Q.A. (A),
Khadkee, Pune 411 003.
(Advocate Shri R.R. Shetty)

... ***Respondents***

ORDER (Oral)

Per : Shri A.J. Rohee, Member (J)

Today when the matter is called out for final hearing, the applicant and Shri N.G. Helekar, learned Advocate for him remained absent. However, Shri R.G. Shatalwar, learned proxy counsel appeared for him.

Shri R.R. Shetty, learned Advocate appeared for the Respondents.

2. This OA pertains to the withdrawal of order regarding MACP which was granted earlier and impugned orders are challenged.
3. Perusal of the order sheets show continuance absence of the

arguing counsel on 30.03.2017, 27.02.2017, 28.10.2016 & 24.08.2016 and on all these times, the proxy counsel appeared for seeking adjournment. Since the OA is listed “High on Board” and it is informed that the arguing counsel is also from Bombay, it appears that applicants are not serious to proceed with the matter. Hence request made by proxy counsel for adjournment is rejected.

4. The OA stands dismissed in default of appearance of the applicants and their learned Advocate to proceed with the matter.

5. No order as to costs.

(R. Vijaykumar)
Member (A)

(Arvind J. Rohee)
Member(J)

dm.