

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

(74)

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 858-OF-1994

DATE OF ORDER: 6th May, 1997

BETWEEN:

A.P.RAO

.. APPLICANT

AND

1. Union of India rep. by the Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel Affairs,
New Delhi,
2. The State of A.P. rep. by the
Chief Secretary to Government,
Secretariat, Hyderabad,
3. The State of A.P. rep. by its
Secretary to Government, G.A.D.
Secretariat, Hyderabad,
4. The Commissioner of Police,
Hyderabad city,
Hyderabad.

.. RESPONDENTS

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: Mr.V.VENKATARAMANAIAH

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr.NR DEVARAJ, Sr.CGSC for R-1
Mr.P.NAVEEN RAO for R-2 to R-4

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR, MEMBER (JUDL.)

ORDER

ORAL ORDER (PER HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR,
MEMBER (JUDL.))

None for the applicant. Heard Mr.N.R.Devaraj,
learned standing counsel for R-1 and Mr.P.Naveen Rao,
learned special counsel for R-2 to R-4.

2. The applicant herein is an I.A.S. Officer against
whom certain disciplinary proceedings are pending. It

(T)

appears that he made a representation to the Inquiry Officer for furnishing certain documents of the inquiry. The Inquiry Officer rejected his prayer. Hence the applicant has filed this OA for the following reliefs:-

(i) Declaring the memorandum No.1850/SC.D/89-24 dated 23.3.94 issued by the 3rd respondent as illegal, void and inoperative;

(ii) To direct the respondents 2 and 3 to furnish all the copies of the documents referred to in the charge memo communicated in G.O.Rt. 213 GAD (SC.) Dept. dt. 18.1.93 to the applicant; and

(iii) To further direct the respondents 2 to 4 to follow the procedure laid down in Rule 27 of the All India Service (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1969 in the service of orders, notices and other processes either by regd. post or by special messenger and not by resorting to service through Police Department.

3. This OA came up for hearing on 2.5.97. On that date, both the applicant and the learned counsel were absent. Hence we ourselves suo moto adjourned the proceedings to 5.5.97. Even on 5.5.97, both the applicant and his counsel were absent. Hence we posted this OA under the heading "for dismissal" today. Even today both the applicant and his counsel ^{are} ~~were~~ absent. The matter is of the year 1994 and we feel that it is not a fit case to grant any more time and, therefore, we are constrained to dismiss this OA for default.



: 4 :

Copy to:-

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Personnel Affairs, Union of India, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Secretary to Govt., State of A.P., Secretariat, Hyd.
3. The Secretary to Govt. GAD, State of A.P. Secretariat, Hyd.
4. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad city, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. V.Venkataramaiah, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
6. One copy to Sri. N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CGSC for R-1, CAT, Hyd
7. One copy to Sri. P.Naveen Rao, advocate, for 2 to 4, CAT, Hyd.
8. One copy to Deputy Registrar(A), CAT, Hyd.
9. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

*self
S. P. A. T.*
9

TYPED BY
COMPIRED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RING.RAJAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI S.S. SHRI PARAMESHWAR:
M(J)

DATED: 6/5/97

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

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

O.A. NO. *858794*

ADMITTED INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED
ALLOWED
DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS
DISMISSED
DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN
ORDERED/REJECTED
NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLR

II COURT

