## Original Application No.24 / 1987.

(Judgment of theTribunal delivered by Hon'ble Member, Mr. D.Surya Rao)

The applicant herein is working as a Supervisor in the O/o. Garrison Engineer (M.E.S.), Chandrayangutta, Hyderabad. By an order no.130/15/FIC dated 18th Nov., 1986, the applicant was placed under suspension with effect from 14-11-86 at 3 P.M. The said order reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS a case against MES-160300 SHRI

MA SALAM, Supvr B&S II Ty (Sk II Apt)im respect of a criminal offence is under investigation/inquiry/trial as per Inspector of Police, VigilanceCell, CS Dept.. RR Dist. Letter no.62/VC-RR/86 dated 14-11-86. NOW, therefore, the undersigned in exercise of powers conferred by sub-rule 9 (2) (a) of 10 of the Central Civil Services OClassification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965. hereby informs the said MES-160300 SHRI MA SALAM, Supvr.B&S II SK II QPT) is deemed to have been suspended by an order of appointing authority w.e.f. 14-11-86 at 3 p.m. It is further ordered that during theperiod of that this order shall remain in force the headquarter of Shri MA Salam, \$upvr.8&S II (SK-II QPt) shall be HYDERABAD and said SHRI M.A. SALAM shall not leave the headquarters without obtaining the previous permission of the undersigned."

It is this order which is sought to be questioned in this application. The learned Counsel for the applicant contends that an order under Rule 10(2) a) of Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal Rules), 1965, the period of suspension has to be limited to the period of detention under custody and not indefinitely. He has relied upon the Judgment of the Central Administrative Tribunal, New Delhi dt.28-11-1986 in M.P.35/86 (A.P. Rao Vs Govt. of A.P. and others) wherein the Tribunal was considering analogous provisions Sewices of All India Discipline and Appeal Rules, viz., sub-rules 2 and 3 of Rule 3 of the said rules.

" A combined reading of the two provisions, sub-rules (2) and (3) of Rule 3, in a way, indicates that the deemed suspension under sub-rule (2) cannot be indefinite or for a period fixed by the State Government. If that were to be so, then the power under sub-rule (3) will become, in relation to such member of the Service, atiose. A combined reading of sub-rules (2) and (3) suggests that the deemed suspension can only be for the duration of the period of custody and

## - page three -

and the Government if so inclined has to pass an order of suspension under sub-rule(3) pending the investigation, inquiry or trial relating to the criminal charge."

Sub-rule (2) of the All India (Discipline and Appeal) Rules corresponde to the Rule  $10(2)(\frac{1}{6})$  of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control Correspondo and Appeal) Rules, whereas sub-rule (3) (relates) to Rule (1)(b) of the said Rules. The relevant provisions are almost identical. We follow the decision of the Central Administrative Tribunal Delhi Bench and we hold that the impugned order directing the suspension of the official indefinitely cannot stand. The suspension under Rule 10(2)(b) of the C.C.S. (C.C.A.)Rules clases to exist the moment the applicant has come out of the custody. It is not denied that the applicant has been released from custody. It is stated in the Counter that the applicant was released on bail on 28-11-1986 by the Criminal Court. Hence, the order of deemed suspension will cease. to be in force after his release from dustody

on 28-11-1986.

'ر <sup>د</sup>ن

The Learned Counsel for the Central Govt.

has contended that even after release (of) bail, the applicant is still in custody. We do not agree with the Learned Counsel's contention (as he has not been able to show any rule or provision of law under which such an interpretation can be arrived at.

The application is accordingly allowed.

No order as to costs.

ໍ່ (ບໍ່ຼີictated in Open Court)

(B.N. DAYASIMHA)

Vice Chairman.

A ST CO

(D. SURYA RAO)

Member.

21st January, 1987.

P6