

13

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

OA No. 577 of 2012
MA No.148 of 2013

Cuttack, this the 12th day of March, 2013

CORAM
HON'BLE MR. A.K. PATNAIK, MEMBER (JUDL.)
HON'BLE MR.R.C.MISRA, MEMBER (ADMN.)

.....

Sri Dinabandhu Prusty,
Aged about 56 years,
Son of Sri Subal Prusty,
Qrs.No.Type-III/39,
Survey of India Residential Colony,
Nayapally,
PO-RRL,
Bhubaneswar-751 013.
Dist. Khurda,
State-Odisha,
Ex-Draughtsman,
Division-I in Odisha Geospatial Data Centre,
Survey of India,
Bhubaneswar-751 013,
Dist.Khurda,
Dist.Odisha.Applicant

(Advocate(s): M/s.K.C.Kanungo,R.C.Bhera,Ms.C.Padhi)

VERSUS

Allee

Union of India Represented through -

1. The Secretary to Govt. of India,
Ministry/Department of Science and Technology,
Technology Bhawan,
New Mehrauli Road,
New Delhi-110 016.
2. The Surveyor General of India,
Survey of India,
Hathibarkala Estate,
Dehra Dun-248 001,
Uttarakhand.
3. The Additional Surveyor General,
Eastern Zone,
Survey of India,
15, Wood Street,
Kolkata-700 016,
West Bengal.
4. The Director,
OGDC,
Survey of India,
2nd Floor,
Survey Bhawan,
Bhubaneswar-751 013,
Dist.Khurda,
Odisha.

.... Respondents

(Advocate(s) – Mr. L.Jena)

O R D E R**A.K.PATNAIK, MEMBER (I):**

The Applicant filed this OA seeking to quash the orders dated 25.6.2012, 20.7.2012 & 30.7.2012 at Annexure-A/3, A/6 & A/8



with further direction to allow the applicant to continue in the Government accommodation till finalization of his statutory appeal preferred by him against the order of dismissal imposed at the conclusion of major disciplinary proceedings.

When the matter was listed on 21.8.2012 this Tribunal directed as under:

"4. Though we do not find any specific period prescribed under the Rules for disposal of the appeal, it is but fair to expect that the Appellate Authority should decide the appeal within a reasonable time. Since the appeal is dated 06.07.2012 and we find that vide Annexure-A/9 the concerned authorities have already taken steps for collecting documents/information required in the disposal of the appeal vide Annexure-A/9 dated 30.7.2012, we consider it appropriate to allow the Appellate Authority a reasonable time so as to come to a conclusion and decide the appeal pending before him. As such, we direct the Appellate Authority i.e. the Respondent No.2 to consider the pending appeal and give his decision with a reasoned order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the copy of the order. During the pendency of the appeal, we direct the concerned authorities/Respondents to allow the applicant to stay in the quarters on payment of rent as per Rules."

By filing MA No. 148 of 2013 the Respondents have brought to the notice of this Tribunal copy of the order of the Appellate Authority dated 24.09.2012 at Annexure-R/1 and states that in view of the aforesaid order there remains nothing further to be adjudicated in this OA and therefore, this OA is liable to be dismissed.



Though Mr.K.C.Kanungo, Learned Counsel for the Applicant was opposing the stand taken by the Respondents, we see justification on the submission of the Respondents made in the MA. Hence after hearing Learned Counsel for both sides this OA stands disposed of being infructuous. Accordingly, MA No.148 of 2013 also stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.


(R.C.MISRA)
Member(Admn.)


(A.K.PATNAIK)
Member(Judl.)