REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE BENCH

女女大學以東大小小 水大水水水水

Commercial Complex(BDA), Indiranagar, Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 1918/84.

Application	No.	708 /8 6 (F)	
W.P. No			

-Applicant Shri K. Prakash Rao To

The Senior Supett of Post Offices, V/s Puttur Division & 2 Ors

- 1. Shri K. Prakash Rao Majalu House Vogga P. D. 574265 Bantwal Taluk Dakshina Kannada District
- 2. Shri N. Shankaranarayana Bhat Advocate S.R. Nagar Bangalore - 560 027

Sublect: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH IN 708/87(F) APPLICATION NO. ____

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order/Interior passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on

Encl : as above.

Balu* RECEIVED 21/8/87

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:BANGALORE DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF AUGUST,1987.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy,

.. Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr.B.N.Jayasimha,

.. Vice-Chairman(A)

APPLICATION NUMBER 708 OF 1987

K.Prakash Rao,
S/o K.Janaka Rao,
Aged about 30 years,
EDS.P.M. Put Off, Vogga 574 265, Bantwal,
Taluk, D.Kannada District.
(By Sri N.Shankaranayana Bhat, Advocate)

.. Applicant.

0.000

- I. The Senior Superintendent of Post Office, Puttur Division, Puttur Division, Puttur, D.Kannada Dist. Puttur 574201.
- 2. The Directgor of Postal Services, South Kanara Region, Bangalore-560 001.
- 3. he Government of India by the Postal Service Board by its Chairman, Department of Posts, Ministry of Communications, New Delhi-110 001.

.. Respondents.

This application having come up for Admission to-day, Vice-Chairman(J) made the following:

ORDER

in this application made under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act,1985, the applicant has challenged Memorandum No. BII/2-14/BTV dated 29-1-1987 of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Puttur Division, Dakshina Kannada ('SSPO').

- 2. Prior to 29-1-1987, the applicant was working as an Extra-Departmental Sub-Post Master ('EDSPM') of Vogga Village, Dakshina Kannada District. On 29-1-1977, the SSPO has put off the applicant from duty on the ground that a criminal case was pending against him.
- 3. Shri N.Shankaranarayana Bhat, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that the order of the SSPO putting off the applicant from duty was unjustified and illegal.
- 4. In the impugned order, the SSPO had expressly stated that a criminal case was pending against the applicant. On that basis, the SSPO exercising the powers conferred on him by Rule 9 of the P & T Extra Departmental Agents (Conduct and Service) Rules,1964 had kept off the applicant from duty.
- 5. Whenever a criminal case was pending, the authority is empowered to place an EDSPM under suspension or, as it is called 'put off duty' pending disposal of that case. In that view, it was undoubtedly open to the SSPO to put off the applicant from duty. We, see no error of jurisdiction or illegality in the order made by the SSPO. We, therefore, reject this application at the admission stage without notices to respondents.

VICE-EHAIRMANULEST

VIÇE-CHAIRMAN(A)

12/8/5

- True copy-

np/

SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRAL EERCH
ADDITIONAL BERCH

BALLINLUME