



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**Mumbai Bench, Mumbai**

**OA No. 322/2021**

**This the 04<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2021**

**(Through Video Conferencing)**

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Atmaram Pundlikrao Wagawag (Sr. Citizen),  
Age 63 years, retired Assistant Postmaster,  
Nanded Head Post Office, Resid:- 92, Girijni,  
House NO. 1-1-237, Mahaveer Society,  
Nanded-431602.

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. D. M. Shukla)

**Versus**

1. The Union of India (through Secretary),  
Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi - 110001.
2. Chief Postmaster General, Maharashtra Circle,  
Mumbai GPO bldg, Mumbai - 400001.
3. Postmaster General,  
Aurangabad Region, Aurangabad - 431002.
4. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nanded Division, Nanded, 431602.

... Respondents



## ORDER (ORAL)

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

The applicant was issued a charge memorandum in the year 2017. Challenging that, he filed OA No. 98/2018 before the Mumbai Bench of this Tribunal, claiming various reliefs. The OA was disposed of by directing the respondents to pass orders on the representation as regards the payment of leave encashment etc., and to conclude the disciplinary proceedings expeditiously. It is stated that the first part of the prayer was complied with, but the respondents have not concluded the disciplinary proceedings as yet. In this background, he filed this OA, with a prayer to direct the respondents to conclude the disciplinary proceedings initiated through the charge memo dated 20.07.2017, on priority basis.

2. Earlier, the matter was heard by the Mumbai Bench. Complaining that the Hon'ble Administrative Member made certain remarks during the course of hearing, Mr. D. M. Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant, addressed a letter dated 30.04.2021. To avoid further complications, it was directed that the matter be posted before this Bench.



3. Today, we heard Mr. D. M. Shukl, learned counsel for the applicant at some length.

4. The grievance of the applicant is about the delay in conclusion of the disciplinary proceedings. It is a different matter that he mentioned so many things, which are not at all relevant for the prayer and obviously for that reason an occasion arose for making certain observations.

5. Be that as it may, the Tribunal has already issued directions for expeditious conclusion of the disciplinary proceedings. If any time is required to be stipulated, the prayer in that behalf must be made in that very OA by filing an MA. When the same is pointed out, the learned counsel for the applicant sought permission of this Tribunal to withdraw the OA with liberty to file an application for fixing time.

6. We, therefore, dismiss the OA as withdrawn and leave it open to the applicant to file an MA, with a prayer to indicate the time for conclusion of the disciplinary proceedings in the order passed in the OA No. 98/2018. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)  
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)  
Chairman

/Lalit/ankit/dsn

JD  
14/10/2021

