

23

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.1479/93

Date of Order: 7.12.93

BETWEEN:

G.Balaram

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Director of Postal
Services, Hyderabad
City Region, Hyderabad.

2. The Senior Supdt. of
Post Offices, Hyderanad
South East Division,
Hyderabad.

.. Respondents,

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.S.Ramakrishna Rao

Counsel for the Respondents.

.. Mr.N.V. Dawana

CORAME

HON'BLE Mr.JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE-CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE Mr.R.RANGARAJAN MEMBER (ADMN.)

OA 1479/93

Judgement dated 20-12-93.

(AS PER SHRI V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE-CHAIRMAN)

--

Heard Shri S. Ramakrishna Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri N.V. Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondent.

The applicant is now working as SPM, Ramanthapur P.O., Hyd. From 22-3-88/3-12-89 he worked as Postal Assistant, Amberpet P.O. In the statement of imputations of misconduct in the charge memo. dated 9-11-93, issued to the applicant it was stated that he officiated as SPM, Amberpet during the following periods from 26-9-88 to 4-11-88, 12-2-89 to 2-4-89, 9-5-89 to 21-5-89 and 16-10-89 to 4-11-89. It is further stated therein that the applicant allowed withdrawals of 2000/- on 19-12-88 and Rs. 1,000/- on 26-12-88 while he was working as office in charge in the off hours of SPM on those two dates and he allowed these above withdrawals without proper verification. The applicant submitted representation dated 13-7-93, to the effect that he was not shown the Attendance Register to show that he officiated as office in charge in the off hours of SPM on those two dates. It is a matter for verification in the appeal filed by the applicant against the order dated 9-11-93 whereby Rs.6396/- was directed to be recovered from him.

It is stated that Smt. Rajeswari, ^aPostal Assistant working in Amberpet post office misappropriated large amounts by not accounting for m

deposits and ^{few two} withdrawals and the ~~xxx~~ transactions referred to in the charge memo. issued to the applicant ^{are in regard to customers for whom} ~~in regard to the transactions handled~~ by Smt. Rajeswari and ~~she had~~ not accounted for the deposits ~~in regard to the customers referred to~~ in the above few transactions.

of recovery as per the impugned order dated 19-11-93 pending disposal of the appeal preferred by him against ^{the} ~~this~~ said order, ^{by} to Respondent 1.

In view of the facts and circumstances, it is a fit case where the recovery ~~has~~ per impugned order dated 9-11-93 has to be suspended ~~by the~~ pending disposal of the appeal preferred by the applicant against ^{the said} ~~this~~ order, ^{by} to Respondent 1.

The OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage. No costs.

J.V. C.C. by 21-12-93.
(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn.)

(V. NEELADRI RAO)
Vice-Chairman

(Open court judgement)

NS

Dy. Registrar (Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. The Director of Postal Services, Hyderabad City Region, Hyd.
2. The Senior Supdt of Post Offices, Hyderabad South East Division Hyderabad.
3. One copy to Sri. S. Rama Krishna Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V. ~~Ramanna~~ CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

③
TYPE

0-A-1479/93
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTHI : MEMBER (A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER (J)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

Dated: 20/12/1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A./R.A./C.A.No.

in
O.A.No.

1479/93

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

