

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
BANGALORE- 560 038.

Dated: 27 JAN 1995

APPLICATION NO: 1869 of 1994.

APPLICANTS:- Smt.C.P.Geetha, Shikaripur, Shimoga Dist.

V/S.

RESPONDENTS:- The Sr.Suptd.of Post Offices, Shimoga Divn. and others.,

To

1. Dr.M.S.Nagaraja, Advocate, No.11, Second Floor,
First Cross, Sujatha Complex, Gandhinagar,
Bangalore-560 009.
2. Sri.G.Shanthappa, Additional Central
Govt.Stng.Counsel, High Court Bldg,
Bangalore-560 001.

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

---XX---

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/
STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/ passed by this Tribunal in the above
mentioned application(s) on 16-01-1995.

Issued on
27/01/95

[Signature]

%

[Signature]
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.1869/1994

MONDAY, THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1995

SHRI JUSTICE P.K. SHYAMSUNDAR .. VICE CHAIRMAN

SHRI T.V. RAMANAN .. MEMBER (A)

Smt. C.P. Geetha,
Aged 36 years,
W/o Sri R. Indusekhar,
Postal Assistant,
Shikaripur Post Office,
Shikaripur, Shimoga District. .. Applicant

(By Advocate Dr. M.S. Nagaraja)

Vs.

1. The Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices,
Shimoga Division, Shimoga - 577 202.
2. The Director of Postal Services,
South Karnataka Region,
Office of the Postmaster General,
Palace Road, Bangalore-560 001.
3. The Union of India
by its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Department of Posts,
New Delhi. ... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri G. Shanthappa,
Addl. Central Govt. Stg. Counsel)

ORDER

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice Chairman:

After having heard Dr. Nagaraja for the applicant and Shri G. Shanthappa, the learned Additional Central Govt. Standing Counsel, we think it appropriate to direct the applicant to prefer a review petition to the President of India a remedy open to her under Rule 29-A of C.C.S. (CCA) Rules.

This, we think is the appropriate measure to be adopted because what is contended is only about the punishment imposed on the applicant by the Appellate Authority enhancing the punishment



imposed by the Disciplinary Authority taking the suo-motu action in that behalf under Rule 29 of C.C.S. (CCA) Rules.

3. Dr. Nagaraja says that, we could ourselves deal with this matter and direct the authorities to take a lenient view and impose a lighter punishment. But, we think that to be not very much within our powers. Dr. Nagaraja relies, in this connection, on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of State Bank of India & Ors. Vs. Samarendra Kishore Endow & Anr. reported in 1994 SCC (L&S) 687, where in the Supreme Court had interfered in the matter of punishment. But, our powers are not commensurate with that of the Supreme Court. Applicant will now prefer a review petition to the President of India and we hope she may succeed there.

4. With this observation, we dismiss this application.

Sd/-
(T.V. RAMANAN)
MEMBER (A)

Sd/-
(P.K.SHYAMSUNDAR)
VICE CHAIRMAN



TRUE COPY
27/01/95
Section Officer
Central Administrative Tribunal
Bangalore Bench
Bangalore