

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O. A. No. 306/92
~~XXXXXX~~

199

DATE OF DECISION 2-3-1992

KB Abdul Khader Applicant (s)

Mr PK Muhammed Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus

VA Kumaran, Superintendent of Respondent (s)
Post Offices, Kasargod Division,
Kasargod and another.

Mr V Krishnakumar, ACGSC Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. SP Mukerji, Vice Chairman
and

The Hon'ble Mr. AV Haridasan, Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *Y*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *M*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *M*
4. To be circulated to all Benches of the Tribunal? *M*

JUDGEMENT

Sh SP Mukerji, V.C

The learned counsel for the respondents appeared before us and indicated that the impugned order dated 11.2.92 at Annexure-F calling upon the applicant to get himself medically examined by the Superintendent of Mental Hospital, Calicut has been withdrawn. In support of this, he ~~was~~ ^{has} produced before us a copy of the communication dated 26.2.92 issued by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Kasargod Division by which the applicant was ^{also} directed to report for duty at Srirampet SO forthwith. The learned counsel, ~~however,~~ states that he understands that the applicant has since reported for duty.

2 In this view of the matter, we feel the main reliefs sought by the applicant in this OA have been accorded to him .

In the circumstance, we ^{admit and} dispose of this application only
with a direction to the respondent that during the period
caused by the impugned order ^{of}
of absence, the applicant should be treated as on duty
for all purposes.

3 There is no order as to costs.


(AV Haridasan)
Judicial Member

 2-3-92
(SP Mukerji)
Vice Chairman

2-3-1992