

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
NEW DELHI

Page No. 2

OA/TA/RA/CCP No. 430 1991

Suraj Ram & Ors. Sh. B. Devasekhar  
APPLICANT(S) COUNSEL

VERSUS

U.O.T.  
RESPONDENT(S) COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>19.2.91.</p> <p>Present : Shri B. Devasekhar, Counsel for the applicants.</p> <p>It is a joint application in the matter of disciplinary proceedings <sup>with separate orders</sup> and such an application is not maintainable. Learned counsel for the applicants seeks three days' time to file separate applications and also to amend the same with reference to the availment of departmental remedies. Time prayed for is allowed. These applications may be listed <del>for hearing</del> <sup>xx</sup> when amended applications are filed. Be listed on 26.2.91.</p> <p>( P. C. Jain ) Member (A)</p> <p>( Ram Pal Singh ) V.C.(J)</p>
	Amended Petition filed on 22/2/91 placed on record.	

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>OA 430/91 MP 581/91</p> <p>26.2.91</p> <p>Present: Sh.B.Dava Sekhar, counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>We have heard the ld. counsel for the applicant on the question of admission.</p> <p>In this application, filed U/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act 1985, the applicant <sup>is</sup> who was posted <sup>as</sup> the Inspector of Works (Estates) Northern Railways, N.Delhi has impugned the order dt. 21.7.89 (annexure P-I) by which he has been placed under suspension with effect from 21.7.89.</p> <p>In accordance with the provisions of rules 18 of the Railways Servants Disciplinary and Appeal Rules, 1968, an appeal lies against the impugned order of suspension. The applicant has not filed any appeal order has made any specific representation against the impugned order of suspension. The ld. counsel for the applicant <sup>is</sup> urged that he is being harassed for the last many years about which, in his various representation made to various authorities, he has sought an open inquiry and these representation may be taken to be <sup>an</sup> <del>availment</del> <sup>availment</sup> of the departmental remedies as provided for in section 20(1) of the Act. We are <del>unable</del> <sup>unable</sup> to uphold this contention. The applicant <sup>is</sup> <del>is</del> <sup>has</sup> <del>is</del> <sup>availed</sup> of the departmental remedies statutorily provided and, as such, the application is premature and it is rejected as such. Needless to say that the applicant would be free to approach the Tribunal with a fresh application at the appropriate time.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><i>(P.C.JAIN)</i></p> <p>( P.C.JAIN )</p> <p>MEMBER (A)</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><i>(RAM PAL SINGH)</i></p> <p>( RAM PAL SINGH )</p> <p>VICE CHAIRMAN (J)</p> </div> </div>