

23

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

O.A.No.725 of 1989.

O.A.No.1563/89

O.A.No.1597/89

Dt : 15-07-1994

P.T.Thomas

S/O Late Shri P.T.Thomas

r/o Quarter No.2054,

Lodhi Road Complex,

New Delhi. - 110003.,

employed as

Deputy Field Officer(G/D)

Research and Analysis Wing,

Cabinet Secretariat,

Government of India,

Room No.8-B, South Block,

New Delhi-110001.

... .. Applicant.

(None appeared - though represented through a
counsel)

vs.

1. Union of India

through Cabinet Secretary,

Government of India,

Rashtrapati Bhavan,

New Delhi.

2. Shri A.K.Verma,

Secretary, Research & Analysis Wing,

Cabinet Secretariat,

Room No.8-B, South Block,

New Delhi-110011

... .. Respondents.

(through Mr M.K.Gupta, Advocate)

Order (oral)

JUSTICE S.K.DHAR, CHAIRMAN

This case has been called in the revised list. No one has appeared on behalf of the applicant.

2. While in service (RAW), the applicant presented this O.A. and prayed therein the following reliefs:

"i) Direct the respondents to circulate a detailed charter of duties of Junior Executive Cadre.

ii) Direct the respondents to post the applicant only at the right place for which the applicant was appointed, trained and oriented as per the charter of duties above.

iii) Quash the adverse ACRs for the period the

applicant was misused for jobs such as Assistant/Storekeeper other than the job/task for which the applicant was selected/appointed/trained without providing him with a copy of charter of duty.

- iv) Declare the assignment of the duties allotted to the applicant so far which are not in conformity with the charter of duties at relief No.1 as arbitrary and all actions/proceedings following from such illegal/arbitrary assignment as void."

3. The O.A. was presented on 5.4.1989.

Shri M.K.Gupta, learned counsel for the respondents states that during pendency of this O.A., the applicant was dismissed from service. For that purpose, the competent authority invoked the provisions of second proviso to Article 311(2) of the Constitution. The applicant challenged the order of dismissal by means of a petition under Article 32 of the Constitution in the Supreme Court, which was dismissed on 29.8.1990.

4. In view of the statement of the learned counsel for the respondents, this O.A. has become infructuous. Accordingly, it is dismissed but without any order as to costs.

B.N. Dhoundiyal
(B.N.Dhoundiyal)
Member(A)

S.K. Shaon
(S.K. Shaon)
Chairman.