

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/020/230/2021**

HYDERABAD, this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021



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

T. Christopher Thomas,  
S/o.Victor Thomas, (Group-C)  
Aged about 58 years,  
Occ: Technician Grade-I,  
O/o. SSE/Electrical/Maintenance,  
Renigunta, Chittoor District,  
Andhra Pradesh.

...Applicant

(By Advocate :Sri K. Altaf Hussain)

Vs.

1. Union of India rep. by  
The General Manager, Rail Nilayam 3<sup>rd</sup> floor,  
South Central Railway,  
Secunderabad – 500 025.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Guntakal Division, South Central Railway,  
Guntakal, Andhra Pradesh.
3. The Additional Divisional Railway Manager,  
Guntakal Division, South Central Railway,  
Guntakal, Andhra Pradesh.
4. The Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer (Maintenance),  
Guntakal Division, South Central Railway,  
Guntakal, Andhra Pradesh.
5. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,  
Guntakal Division, South Central Railway,  
Guntakal, South Central Railway,  
Andhra Pradesh.

....Respondents

(By Advocate:Sri S.M. Patnaik, SC for Rlys.)

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member)**

The present O.A. has been filed seeking the following relief:



“..... to direct the Respondent No.3 to consider the appeal in the light of the points raised by the applicant and pass considered orders at the earliest and pass further order or orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant was issued a charge memo dated 16.5.2017 alleging that he received certain amount for providing job to his relative's son. However, the inquiry report states that there is no evidence to prove that the amount transferred is intended for securing the job. Based on the inquiry report, the Disciplinary Authority imposed the penalty of reduction to one stage lower i.e. from Tech. Gr.I to Tech. Gr.II for a period of two years vide proceedings dated 23.8.2019. The applicant preferred an appeal against the orders of the Disciplinary Authority on 10.10.2019, but the same is still pending with the Appellate Authority.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the applicant has approached this Tribunal without exhausting the departmental remedies. He further submits on instructions that no appeal is received from the applicant. At this stage, learned counsel for the applicant submits that this O.A. be treated as appeal of the applicant.

4. After considering the rival contentions, we are of this view that let this O.A. be treated as appeal by the Appellate Authority and be disposed

of within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of this order. If the grievance still subsists, the applicant is at liberty to approach this Tribunal once again.

5. With the above observation, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage, without going into the merits of the case. No order as to costs.



**(B.V.SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

/pv/