CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

OA/21/784/2017

HYDERABAD, this the 21ST DAY OF JANUARY 2020

Hon'ble Mr. ASHISH KALIA, MEMBER (J)
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. SUDHAKAR, MEMBER (A)

K SURESH KUMAR,
S//o K Sundara Appa Rao,
Aged about 29 years,
Occ: Office Assistant,
(Under the orders of suspension),
O/o Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Hyderabad City Division, General Post Office,
Abids, Hyderabd 500001,
R/o Q.No.71-D, GPRA Campus,
Gachibowli, Hyderabad 500032.

... Applicant

(By advocate: Dr. A. Raghu Kumar)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by
The Director General, Posts,
Dept. of Posts, Govt. of India,
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi 110 001,

2. The Chief Post Master General,
Telangana Circle,
Hyderabad 500001,

3. The Postmaster General,
Hyderabad Headquarters Region,
Dak Sadan, Abids, Hyderabad 500 001,

4. The Director of Postal Services,
O/o Postmaster General,
Hyderabad Headquarters Region,
Dak Sadan, Abids, Hyderabad 500 001,

5. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Hyderabad City Division,
Hyderabad-1.

…Respondents.

(By Advocate: Mrs. L Pranathi Reddy, Addl. CGSC)

O R A L O R D E R

PER HON'BLE Mr. **ASHISH KALIA, MEMBER (J)**

This Original Application was filed under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 praying for the following relief(s):

> "To call for the records pertaining to the respondents order in Memo. No. F/CBI cases/ DM/KSK/2016 dated 28.02.2017, Letter No.HQR/Vig/Appeal/11/KSK/2017 dated 07.08.2017, Memo.No. F/CBI cases/DM/KSK/ 2016 dated 17.08.2017 and Memo.No.F/CBI cases/DM/KSK/2016 dated 28.08.2017 and quash and set aside the same as illegal, arbitrary, violative of Article 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and violative of the provisions of Rule 10 of the CCS (CCA) Rules and the provisions of Fundamental Rule 53 and catena of judgments by the Apex Court as well as other judicial fora on the subject matter and consequently declare that the applicant is entitled for reinstatement with effect from 06.03.2017 onwards with all consequential benefits, in the interest of justice.

2. We heard learned counsel on both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the relief sought for has already been granted to the applicant and nothing survives in this OA.

4. OA is accordingly dismissed as infructuous. .

5. There shall be no order as to costs.

(B V SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(ASHISH KALIA)
MEMBER (J)

vsn