

(03)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 667/91

199

T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION

84-92

Shri Govind Anand Karvande Petitioner

Shri D.V.Gangal Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India Respondent

Shri V.S.Masurkar Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A)

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

  
(U.C.Srivastava)  
Vice-Chairman

mbm\*

(04)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 667/91

Shri Govind Anand Karvande ... Applicant

vs

Union of India  
Through Divisional Engineer  
Phones, Pune. ... Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, Vice-Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A)

Mr. D.V.Gangal, Advocate, for Rajesh Behare  
for the applicant.

Mr. V.S. Masurkar  
for the respondent.

Dated: 8-4-92

Judgement  
(Per: Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, Vice-Chairman)

The applicant was working as a Junior Telecom Officer at Junnar since 1982. He was suspended on 1st January 1991 stating that criminal charges are <sup>pending</sup> against the applicant. The applicant was prosecuted in the court of Special Judge, Bombay, and ~~that~~ the charge sheet has been filed against the applicant in the Court of Addl. Special Judge Bombay, by the C.B.I. This Tribunal cannot pass any order as the applicant <sup>is</sup> ~~has~~ not filed against the charges framed. This application is pre-matured as the applicant has not appealed against the suspension. The applicant may come to Tribunal after CBI's case. The Tribunal cannot interfere with the same. Learned counsel for the applicant <sup>contended</sup> that since the criminal case <sup>is</sup> pending in the court and it may take some more time, the applicant may be exonerated from the suspension order passed by the respondent.

(05)

2. We do not find any reason to ~~maintain~~  
this application <sup>in</sup> with the Tribunal. Applicant, if so advised  
may approach this Tribunal again, <sup>after the criminal case is decided</sup> The case is dismissed  
with no order as to costs.

  
(M.Y. Priolkar)  
Member (J)

  
(U.C. Srivastava)  
Vice-Chairman