

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

O.A.No.483/06

Friday this the 30th day of June 2006

C O R A M :-

**HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR.GEORGE PARACKEN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

A.K.Magare,
Executive Engineer (Civil) (under suspension),
Postal Civil Division, Trivandrum, Kerala.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Mr.Mohan Pulickal)

Versus

1. Union of India represented by the Secretary,
Ministry of Communication & Information Technology,
Department of Telecommunication,
1112, Sanchar Bhavan, 20,
Ashoka Road, New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Chairman,
Department of Telecommunication,
1112, Sanchar Bhavan, 20,
Ashoka Road, New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Director (VA),
Department of Telecommunication,
1112, Sanchar Bhavan, 20,
Ashoka Road, New Delhi – 110 001.
4. The Director (V-I),
Department of Telecommunication,
1112, Sanchar Bhavan, 20,
Ashoka Road, New Delhi – 110 001.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Mr.T.P.M.Ibrahim Khan,SCGSC)

This application having been heard on 30th June 2006 the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following :-

ORDER

HON'BLE MRS.SATHI NAIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicant was placed under suspension by Annexure A-1 order on the ground that a case against him in respect of a criminal offence was under investigation as he could not satisfactorily explain a sum of

.2.

Rs.60,000/- in his possession to the C.B.I. The suspension has been reviewed periodically. The investigation has been completed and the charge sheet is being filed by the C.B.I before the C.B.I Court. The applicant is aggrieved by his continued suspension and non consideration of his request for increase in the percentage of subsistence allowance. It is seen from Annexure A-3 impugned order that the competent authority has reviewed the case of the applicant and decided to extend his suspension for a further period of 180 days from 30.6.2006.

2. When the matter came up today, counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant has filed a representation dated 15.5.2006 to the President of India which has not been considered so far. He further submitted that he would be satisfied if the competent authority is directed to consider the representation in the light of the instructions on the subject as the review is due.

3. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, we direct the 1st respondent or any other competent authority in this regard to consider and dispose of Annexure A-6 representation of the applicant dated 15.5.2006 as the review is also due and convey a decision to the applicant within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Copies of the O.A may also be forwarded to the 1st respondent. No order as to costs.

(Dated the 30th day of June 2006)


GEORGE PARACKEN
JUDICIAL MEMBER


SATHI NAIR
VICE CHAIRMAN