

(31)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No. 763 of 1987

Date of Order: 12/02/1990

T.Rangaiah

..Applicant

and

The Additional Post Master General,
O/o the Post Master General,
Hyderabad, and 2 others

..Respondents

...

For Applicant: Mr.K.S.R.Anjaneyulu, Advocate

For Respondents: Mr.J.Ashok Kumar, SC for Postal

..

C O R A M:

HON'BLE SHRI B.N.JAYASIMHA: VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI D.SURYA RAO: MEMBER(JUDICIAL)

.. ..

(Judgment delivered by Shri B.N.Jayasimha, Vice Chairman)

.. ..

1. This is an application from the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices (Under suspension) challenging the orders dated 7-8-1987 and 13-11-1987, passed by the Director of Postal Services, Andhra Pradesh, Northern Region, Hyderabad, placing him under suspension.

2. The applicant states that he was working as Assistant Superintendent of Post offices in the office of Superintendent of Post Offices, Adilabad in Adilabad. He has completed 28 years of service without any adverse remarks regarding his work and conduct. By an order

bvi

contd....2

17/2

To:

1. The Additional post master general, office of the post Master General, Hyderabad.
2. The Director of postal services, Andhra Pradesh, Northern Region, Hyderabad.
3. The Superintendent of post offices, Adilabad division, Adilabad.
4. One copy to Mr.K.S.R.Anjaneyulu,Advocate, ***288
1-1-365/A,Jawaharnagar, Bakaram,Hyderabad-500 020.
5. One copy to Mr.J.Ashok Kumar,SC for postal department, CAT,Hyderabad.
6. One spare copy.

. . .

kj.

19/12/90

29

dated 7-8-1987, the Director of Postal Services, A.P. Northern Region, Hyderabad placed the applicant under suspension without assigning any reasons. The applicant is continuing under suspension without any further action whatsoever. The applicant states that as per the instructions and orders issued under Department of Personnel ^{Memo} dated 4-2-1971, a charge-sheet should be issued within 3 months from the date of suspension. The applicant, therefore, contends that the action of the respondents ~~to~~ continuing him under suspension without any action is arbitrary and ~~is~~ violation of Rules and guidelines. Hence, he filed this application.

3. In the counter filed by the respondents, it is stated that the applicant was placed under suspension ^{pending} contemplated disciplinary action against him, as serious complaints were received against him. ^A The review on the subsisting allowance was also made at the end of three months from the date of suspension as per instructions. It is contended that there is no violation of any rules or procedure in placing the applicant under suspension beyond three months.

4. We have ^{heard} Shri K.S.R. Anjaneyulu, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri J. Ashok Kumar, SC for the Department

5. It is stated that the order of suspension was revoked in Memo No. RDH/ST/20-5/2/88, dated 7-12-1988 and the application has therefore become infructuous. In the circumstances, the application is dismissed as having become infructuous. No costs. (Dictated in open court)

B.N. Jayasimha
(B.N. JAYASIMHA)
Vice Chairman

D. Surya Rao
(D. SURYA RAO)
Member (Judl.)

Dt. 12th February, 1990.

SQH*

....

S. Sankar
Deputy Registrar
19/2/90

*2nd
ST*