## CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor, Commercial Complex, Indiranagar, Bangalore-560038. Dated: 6 SFP 1993

APPLICATION NO(S) 226 of 1993.

APPLICANTS: Kum.D.S.Sume v/s. RESPONDENTS: Senior Supdt.of Post Offices, Koler Division, & Others.

- Kum.D.S.Suma,D/o.D.S.Sathyanarayana Rao, Branch Post Master, S. Wevagenehallim, Via: Perasendra Post, Siddalaghatta Taluk, Kolar Dist.
- Sri.S.K.Mohiyuddin, Advocate, No.11, Jeevan Building, K.P.East, Bangalore-1.
- 3. The Sr.Supdt.of Post OfficessKolar Division, Kolar.
- 4. The Chief Post Master General, Palace Road, Bangalore.
- 5. Sri.G.Shanthappa, Central Govt.Stng.Counsel, Bangalore.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore,

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/STAY/INTERIM ORDER, passed by this Tribunal in the above said application(s) on 19th August, 1993.

Joseph

Olo

DEPUTY REGISTRAR

om<del>\*</del>

# CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1993.

#### PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar,

.. Vice-Chairman.

And

Hon'ble Mr. V.Ramakrishnan,

.. Member(A)

### APPLICATION NUMBER 226 OF 1993

Kum.D.S.Suma, D/o D.S.Sathyanarayana Rao, Aged about 23 years, working as Branch Post Master, S.Devaganahalli, Via: Perasandra P.O., Siddalaghatta Taluk, Kolar District.

.. Applicant.

(By Sri S.K.Mohiyuddin, Advocate, absent)

- 1. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Kolar Division, Kolar.
- 2. The Chief Post Master General, Palace Road, Bangalore-560 001.

.. Respondents.

(By Sri G.Shanthappa, Standing Counsel, absent)

This application having come up for hearing to-day, Hon'ble Vice-Chairman made the following:

#### ORDER

Maving considered the matter ourselves without the assistance of counsel we find this application is nothing but a dispute by the daughter and a father, a non-party. It so happened, the applicant's father was the Branch Post Master, S.Devaganahalli, Kolar District who was put off duty there being the prospect of holding a disciplinary inquiry against him. In the vacancy so caused, his daughter (applicant) was inducted and that arrangement undoubtedly was purely transitory in nature and to last only till the father could come back to resume his office after the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings. Later-

OF F

on the department thought that it was not proper to continue the daughter in any office that was substantively held by her father and therefore, ordered that her services be terminated and a direction given to hand over charge. She did not comply with that direction instead she came to this Tribunal asking us to continue her in office till her father was cleared at the departmental inquiry.

Now we have on record an official communication from the Department stating the decision to put off the father on duty was revoked and the father directed to be reinstated in office with effect from 6-7-1993. Now surely the daughter cannot be said to be aggrieved if the father is assuming duties as the Branch Post Master particularly when she was appointed to hold the said post in his absence. Having regard to the foregoing development with or without any such order the posting of the applicant as Branch Post Master comes to an end without more. When such is the position, the applicant has to bow out of office handing over charge to her father who is the substantive holder of the said office.

For the reasons mentioned above, this application stands terminated finally on the ground that it has become infructuous in the light of the subsequent development noticed above. No

ENINISTE AND THE STATE OF THE S

MEMBER(A)

VICE-CHAIRMAN

n. de - 6/0 /25