

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.NO. 92 of 99.

Friday this the 5th day of February 1999.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

K.C. Santhoshan,
Postman (Removed),
Chemmancheri P.O.
Vadakara Division,
Calicut District,
(Residing at Karindiri Kandan Chalil House,
P.O. Mehaniam, Perambra(via),
Calicut District-673 525).

.. Applicant

(By Advocate Shri M.R. Rajendran Nair)

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Vadakara Division, Vadakara.
2. The Director of Postal Services,
Northern Region, Calicut.
3. Member (Personal), Postal Services Board,
New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri T.A. Unnikrishnan, ACGSC)

The application having been heard on 5th February 1999,
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

The challenge in this application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 is against the order dated 15.10.96, A-1 of the first respondent imposing on the applicant, an Ex-Leave Reserve Postman a penalty of removal from service with immediate effect and the order dated 12.3.97(A-2) of the Postmaster General, the appellate authority rejecting the applicant's appeal. Aggrieved by the orders A-1 and A-2, the applicant has preferred a revision to the 3rd respondent (A-6) which is yet to be considered and disposed of. The applicant has, therefore, approached this Tribunal challenging A-1 and A-2 and alternatively praying that the 3rd respondent be directed to consider the A-6 revision petition and give the applicant a speaking order within a reasonable time.

2. When the application came up for hearing, the learned counsel for the respondents under instructions from the respondents stated that the application may be disposed of granting the applicant the alternative relief prayed for but giving the 3rd respondent five months time to dispose of the revision petition.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant states that the applicant would be satisfied if the application is disposed of as suggested by the learned counsel of the respondents.
4. In the result, as agreed to by the learned counsel one either side, the application is disposed of directing the 3rd respondent to consider the revision petition submitted by the applicant(A-6) in accordance with law and to give the applicant a speaking order within a period of five months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There is no order as to costs.

Dated this the 5th day of February 1999.



A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

rv

LIST OF ANNEXURES

1. Annexure A1: True copy of the Order No.F1/3/93-94 dated 15.10.96 issued by the 1st respondent.
2. Annexure A2: True copy of the Order No.Staff/30-19/96 issued by the 2nd respondent (dated 12.3.97).
3. Annexure A6: True copy of the revision petition dated 13.10.97 submitted by the applicant to the 3rd respondent.

.....