

19

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

* * *

O.A. 356/94

Dt. of Decision : 31.3.94

Sri B. John Peter

.. Applicant

Vs

1. Union of India, represented by its
South Central Railway,
Rail Nilayan (III Floor),
Secunderabad.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
O/o Divl. Railway Manager,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Commercial Manager,
O/o Divl. Railway Manager,
South Central Railway.
4. The Divisional Operating Manager,
O/o The Divisional Manager,
Hyderabad Division,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad.
5. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
O/o Divl. Railway Manager,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. P.N.A.Christian

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC

CORAM:

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

Copy to:-

1. General Manager, South Central Railway, Raemnilayam (III Floor), Union of India, Secunderabad.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, O/O Divl. Railway Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Commercial Manager, O/O Divl. Railway Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad.
4. The Divisional Operating Manager, O/O The Divisional Manager, Hyderabad Division, South Central Railway, Secunderabad.
5. The Divisional Personnel Officer, O/O Divl. Railway Manager, South Central Railway, Secunderabad.
6. One copy to Sri. P.N.Christian, advocate, H.No.10-3-1/3 (I Floor) Entrenchment road, East Marredpally, Sec'bad-26.
7. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, SC for Railways, CAT, Hyd.
8. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
9. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

20

OA No. 356/94.

JUDGMENT

Dt: 31.3.94

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN)

Heard Shri E.N.A.Christian, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri N.V.Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA was filed assailing the order dated 14.3.1994 of the 4th respondent whereby the applicant was suspended. One of the contentions raised in this OA is that the 4th respondent is not competent to suspend the applicant. But as the impugned order dated 14.3.1994 was revoked by the 3rd respondent, this OA becomes infructuous, submitted the learned counsel for the applicant. But it is stated that it is without prejudice to his contention that the 4th respondent is not empowered to place him under suspension.

3. In the result, the OA is dismissed at the admission stage as it had become infructuous. No costs.

One
(R.RANGARAJAN)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Neeladri
(V.NEELADRI RAO)
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 31st March, 1994.
Open court dictation.

vsn

*Amirtha
13/3/94
Dy. Registrar (Jd.)*

Contd-- 3/-

D.T. 7/4/94

O.A-356/93

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.A.B.GORTHI : MEMBER(AD)
AND

THE HON'BLE MR.TCCHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER(JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.R.RANGARAJAN : M(ADMN)

Dated: 31/3/1994

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

O.A.No.

in
356/94

T.A.No.

(w.p.)

Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

pvm

