

(39)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

D.A.No. 413/93

T.A.No.

Dt. of Decision: 3-5-93

Syed Gouse,

Petitioner

Shri Md.Gulam Rasool,

Advocate for
the Petitioner
(s)

Versus

The General Manager, Indian Govt., Mint,Hyd. Respondent.

Shri NR Devraj,

Advocate for
the Respondent
(s)

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE MR. P.T.THIRUVENGADAM : MEMBER (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?
5. Remarks of Vice-Chairman on Columns 1,2,4 (to be submitted to Hon'ble Vice-Chairman where he is not on the Bench.)

av1/


(HPTT)
M(A)


(HVNRJ)
CVC

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

OA No.413/93.

Dt. of Order:3-5-93.

Syed Gouse

...Applicant

vs.

1. The General Manager,
Indian Govt., Mint,
Hyderabad.

...Respondent

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri Md.Gulam Rasool

Counsel for the Respondent : Shri N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC

-- -- --

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE MR.P.T.THIRUVENGADAM : MEMBER (A)

(Order of the Division Bench passed by Hon'ble
Justice Mr.V.Neeladri Rao, Vice-Chairman).

-- -- --

This O.A. was presented praying for a declaration
that the three suspension orders that were issued in 1989,
1990 and 1992 are arbitrary, illegal and for a consequential
declaration that the applicant is entitled for full emoluments
for those three suspension periods. It is the case of the
applicant that three chargesheets were issued and each of the
suspensions is in regard to each enquiry and all those orders
of suspensions are revoked. The relevant rules laydown as to
how the period of suspension has to be treated and they are
very clear in this regard.

32

2. The orders of suspension of 1989 and 1990 are barred by limitation. This O.A. was filed after the three orders of suspension were revoked. While the first two suspension orders are barred, they are laches, in regard to the third suspension order, as this O.A. is filed after it is revoked.

3. Accordingly the O.A. is dismissed at the admission stage itself. It is needless to say that the respondents will act in accordance with the rules in regard to periods of suspension after each of the enquiries is over. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(P.T.THIRUVENGADAM)
Member (A)

Sd/-
(V.NEELADRI RAO)
Vice-Chairman

Dy. Registrar (J)

1593

Dated: 3rd May, 1993.
Dictated in Open Court

av1/

To

1. The General Manager,
Indian Govt. Mint, Hyd.
2. One Copy to Mr. Gulam Rasool, Advocate, 3-2-763,
Kachiguda, Hyd.
3. One copy to Mr. N.R. Devraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

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

AND
THE HON'BLE MR. K. *P.T.T. Venkateswaran*
ELASUBRAMANIAN :
MEMBER(ADMN)

AND

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

DATED: 3 - 5 - 1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 413/93

T.A.No. | (W.P.No)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions *Central Administrative Tribunal*
Dismissed as withdrawn *DISPATCH*

Dismissed

Dismissed for default *HYDERABAD BENCH*

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

19 MAY 1993

pvm

11/3