

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00142/2018

DATED THIS THE 31ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 2019

HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, MEMBER (J)

HON'BLE SHRI C.V. SANKAR, MEMBER (A)

K. Arunkumar,
Aged 59 years,
S/o of Late Rukmayya Bhandari,
Ex-GDS MD, Kukkundur SO – 576 117, Karkala HO,
Residing at 'Krishna', A.C. Raod, Kukkundur,
Karkala Taluk

.....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri B. Venkateshan)

Vs.

1. The Union of India,
Represented by the Secretary,
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan,
New Delhi 110 001

2. The Sr. Supdt. Of Post Offices,
Puttur Division, Puttur 574 201

3. The Asst. Supdt. Of Post Offices,
Bantwal Sub Division, Jodumarga 574 219,
Under Puttur Division [DK],

.....Respondents

(By Shri V.N. Holla, Counsel for Respondents)

O R D E R (ORAL)
(HON'BLE DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER (J))

Applicant would submit that there is only a question of delay in
delivery of letters and that applicant was suffering from stomach ulcer and that

is why he could not deliver in time. Per contra, Shri V.N. Holla, learned counsel for the respondents, would submit that it is not correct and around 570 letters were found to be not delivered at all other than the delay and therefore having 35 years of service is no ground for interference as what is discovered in these kind of thing in the postal department is only the tip of the iceberg because of the peculiar nature of the department itself. Because of the huge volume of business, a fair amount of trust has been placed on the employees and supervision is impossible. Therefore, unless deterrent steps are taken, the department will come to great prejudice as well as the general public.

2. We had gone through the records and found that applicant had been granted all opportunities of defence and he has utilized it. Therefore, we do not think that anything more need be required to be said. Since the charge against the applicant had been proven and, in the circumstances of the department, the punishment imposed also seems to be appropriate.

3. Therefore, there is no merit in the OA. The OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(C.V. SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)
MEMBER (J)

Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA No. 170/00142/2018

Annexure A1 Copy of the discharge summary with medical bills of applicant
Annexure A2 Copy of the ASPOs memo dated 27.04.2017
Annexure A3 Copy of the PO's brief dated 04.07.2017
Annexure A4 Copy of the applicant's representation dated 13.07.2017
Annexure A5 Copy of the IO's report dated 20.07.2017
Annexure A6 Copy of the applicant's representation dated 07.08.2019
Annexure A7 Copy of the ADA's memo dated 18.09.2017
Annexure A8 Copy of the applicant's appeal dated 07.10.2017
Annexure A9 Copy of the order dated 03.11.2017

Annexures referred in reply statement

Annexure R1 Copy of the mahazar dated 17.10.2016
Annexure R2 Copy of the complaint dated 15.03.2005
Annexure R3 Copy of the complaint dated 17.10.2016
Annexure R4 Copy of the complaint to the ASP, Karkala

* * * * *