

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

Original Application No.20/913/2016

Hyderabad, this the 22nd day of January, 2020



***Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Member (Judl.)*
*Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)***

Ch.V.K. Prabhakar, S/o. Ch. Subramanya Sastry,
Aged 48 years, Occ: Office Superintendent,
Vijayawada Division, SC Railway,
R/o. C/o. The Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer (TRS),
Electric Loco Shed, Vijayawada.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. K R K V Prasad)

Vs.

1. Union of India, Rep. by the General Manager,
South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
2. The Senior Deputy General Manager (Vigilance),
South Central Railway, 3rd Floor, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
3. The Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer (TRS),
South Central Railway, Electric Loco Shed, Vijayawada.
4. The Principal & Inquiry Officer,
South Central Railway,
Electric Traction Training Centre, Vijayawada.
5. The Assistant Divisional Electrical Engineer (Operations),
O/o. The Divisional Railway Manager,
South Central Railway, Vijayawada Division, Vijayawada.
6. The Assistant Divisional Electrical Engineer (Operations),
O/o. The Divisional Railway Manager,
South Central Railway, Vijayawada Division,
Vijayawada.

... Respondents

(By Advocates: Mr. S.M. Patnaik, SC for Railways)

ORAL ORDER

{As per B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}

2. The OA was filed in 2016 in regard to the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the applicant. An interim order was granted by this Tribunal on 01.09.2016 directing the respondents not to pass final order in the inquiry proceedings against the applicant without the leave of this court.



3. Today, learned counsel for the respondents has submitted across the Bar, a letter dated 1.1.2020 addressed to him by the Respondents, wherein it was observed that the Inquiry Officer has concluded that the Articles of Charge framed against the applicant are “not proved” and in view of the said findings of the Inquiry Officer, the competent disciplinary authority proposed to drop the charges levelled against the applicant.

4. In view of the above letter of the respondents, with the consent of both the counsel, the OA is dismissed as infructuous, as nothing remains to be adjudicated in the matter. No order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

(ASHISH KALIA)
MEMBER (JUDL.)

/evr/