

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated: 3-7-87

Application No. 1	86/87 (F)	/88()	
DEXR. DICK	-		

Applicant

C.K.Mallikarjunaswamy To

V/s. Superintendent of Spost Offices, Tumkur

- 1. Shri.C.K.Mallikarjunaswamy, Pestal Assistant, Tumkur Head Pest Office, Tumkur- 572 101.
- 4. Shri.M. Vasudeva Rae, Central Gevt. Standing Bounsel, High Court Buildings. Bangalere- 1.
- 2. Shri.M.R.Achar. Advocate, Ne. 1074- 1075, Ist Stage, B.S.K. Mysers Bank Celenym Opp. Raghavendra Nursing Home, B'lore- 50.
- 3. The Superintendent of Spost Offices, Tumkur Division, Tumkur- 572 102.

Sublect: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH IN APPLICATION NO. 186/87(F)

passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on 26—6—87.

Encl : as above.

Balu*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF JUNE, 1987 Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman and Hon'ble Shri L.H.A. Rego, Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 186/87

Shri C.K. Mallikarjuna Swamy, Postal Assistant, Tumkur Head Post Office. Tumkur-572 101.

Applicant

(Shri M.R. Achar, Advocate)

v.

The Superintendent of Post Offices, Tumkur Division, Tumkur-572 102.

.... Respondent

(Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, CGSC)

This application having come up for hearing to-day, Vice-Chairman made the following.

ORDER

This is an application made by the applicant under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act').

The applicant is working as Postal Assistant at 2. the Bazaar Post Office, Tumkur, which is under the jurisdiction of Postal Superintendent., Tumkur (Supdt.). In a disciplinary proceeding instituted against the applicant under the CCS (CC&A) Rules, 1965, (the Rules), the Superintendent had appointed one Shri B.M. Hanumantha Rao as Inquiry Officer (IO) and one Shri Madhavachar as

the Presenting Officer (PO). In those proceedings pending before the IO, the applicant represented to the Director of Postal Services SK Region, Bangalore (Director) to change the PO and the IO, but the Director by his order dated 13.11.1986 had rejected the same. Hence this application.

- The applicant in reiterating his case for change of PO and IO had sought for appropriate direction to the respondent, who in justification of the order had filed its reply.
- 4. Shri M.R. Achar, learned counsel for the applicant contends that everyone of the facts and circumstances pleaded by the applicant justified the Director to change the PO and IO.
- 5. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned counsel for the Respondent sought to support the order of the Director.
- 6. In his application, before the Director as also before this Tribunal the applicant had not given any justifiable reasons for the change of the PO and the IO. The applicant had sought for change of the officers without giving reasons in support of the same.
- 7. After all a person who is facing a disciplinary proceeding, cannot ask for the change of the IO and the PO without justifiable reasons. The one justifiable

reason which is normally accepted is the personal bias of the officers against the delinquent official. We have not been shown that either of the officers had any personal bias against the applicant. If that is so, then the order of the Director cannot be interfered by us. But this does not mean, that the competent authority cannot change either of them in future on any new circumstances.

ministrative and make the second seco

8. In the light of our above discussion, we hold that this application is liable to be dismissed. We, therefore, dismiss this application. But in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.

" Truespy"

8d ———

84 - - -

Member (A) / 26.6.87

Vice-Chairman (8/3)

-True Copy.

bsv/Mrv.

SECTION OFFICER TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH BANGALORE