

(46)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH: AT
HYDERABAD.

O.A.NO. 958/95.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 20-09-95.

BETWEEN:

A.Venkateswarlu

..Applicant.

VS.

1. The Supdt. of Post Offices,
Nandyal Postal Division,
Nandyal - 518 501.
2. The Director of Postal Services,
A.P.Southern Region, Kurnool.

.. Respondents.

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: SHRI **S. Remakrishna Rao**

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI **V.Bhimanna,**
Ex/Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

••2..

To

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Nandyal ~~Division~~ Postal Division,
Nandyal - 518 501.
2. The Director of Postal Services,
A.P. Southern Region, Kurnool.
3. One copy to Mr.S.Ramakrishna Rao, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr.V.Bheemanna, Addl.cGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One spare copy.

YLR

DA.958/95

(97)

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, VC)

Heard Sri S. Ramakrishnan Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri V. Bhimanna, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant who is under suspension as per order dated 5-3-94, pending disciplinary proceedings filed this OA for a direction to the respondents to reinstate him pending inquiry as his suspension was about 18 months back.

3. It is submitted for the respondents that the charges against the applicant is for alleged misappropriation of more than Rs. 3 lakhs with reference to Kisan Vikas Patras and amount deposited towards SB accounts

3. The further contention for the respondents is that as the applicant is not appearing for the inquiry, and it had become necessary for the inquiry officer to adjourn the inquiry from time to time and hence even the subsistence allowance was reduced to 25%. But it is stated for the applicant that he is sick and he could not attend inquiry once, and later on he had not attended the inquiry as the earlier OA that was filed by the applicant was pending before this Bench ~~for two months~~ ^{for two years}.

4. We feel that in view of the gravity of the offence alleged it is not a fit case for ordering revocation of the suspension. We hope that the inquiry ~~would~~ ^{will} be disposed off early and the applicant had to co-operate for the early disposal of the inquiry in his own interest.

5. The OA is dismissed accordingly even at the admission stage. No costs.//

(R. Rangarajan)
Member (Admn)

V. Neeladri Rao
Vice Chairman

Dated: Sept. 20, 95
Dictated in open court

Avuly Regd.
Deputy Regd.

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED 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.R.RANGARAJAN : M(ADMN)

DATED:- 20 - 9 -1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT.

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

in

O.A.No. 958 /95

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

No Spare Copy

