

40

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

..

O.A.No.465/95
- - - - -

Date of decision: 31st December, 1997.
--

Between:

and

1. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Hyderabad South East Division, Hyderabad- 27.
2. The Director Postal Services, Hyderabad City
Region, Hyderabad.
3. The Chief Post Master General, A.P.Circle,
Hyderabad.

Respondents.

Counsel for the applicant: Sri P.Rathaiah.

Counsel for the respondents: Sri N.V.Raghava Reddy.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SRI R.RANGARAJAN, Member (A)

Hon'ble Sri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J)

JUDGMENT:

(per Hon'ble Sri B.S. Jai Parameshwar, Member (J))
--

None for the applicant. Heard Sri N.R.Devaraj,
the learned counsel for the respondents.

We are deciding this O.A., in accordance with
Rule 15(1) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure)
Rules, 1987.

Je

: 3 :

raised by the applicant and ultimately agreed with the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority.

The applicant has filed this O.A., challenging the Orders passed by the said Authorities which ultimately confirmed the removal of the applicant from service.

The respondents have filed their counter stating that there were number of complaints received against the performance of the applicant, that the two old age pension ~~money~~ ^{were} payees ~~are~~ ^{or} illiterate ladies and after perusing their thumb impressions on the Original money order paid vouchers, they deposed in their statement given before the Investigating Officer on 5-2-1990 that the thumb impressions ~~are~~ ^{were} not ^{of} their own, that the thumb impressions of the payees on the statements dated 5-2-1990 and the thumb impressions on the original money order paid vouchers clearly differed and further the Disciplinary Authority relied upon the report of the Inquiry Officer and the circumstances available before the Disciplinary Authority are sufficient enough to prove the mis-conduct levelled against the applicant.


The case of the applicant is that the Authorities have not considered the various grounds raised by him in the appeal.


: 4 :

We have gone through the order passed by the Chief Post Master General. In para (4) of his order, he has specifically stated the observations and the grounds raised by the applicant. Further the Appellate Authority ~~has analysed the findings and evidence~~ and The applicant had cited one Yadayya as his witness. The said witness had not supported the case of the applicant. The Authorities have considered the facts available on record and have come to the conclusion that the applicant had not paid the money order amounts payable to Pochamma and Radhamma. This Tribunal cannot reappraise the evidence when all the authorities have concurrently confirmed the opinion that the applicant had committed the mis-conduct, in that, he had failed to pay the Money Order amounts to two ladies viz., Pochamma and Radhamma. We find no reasons to differ with the conclusions reached by the Authorities. Hence, we find no merit in this O.A.

In this view of the matter, the O.A., is dismissed.

There will be no order as to costs.



B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR,
Member (J)


R. RANGARAJAN,
Member (A)

31.12.97

Date: 31--12--1997.

Dictated in open Court.


M. P. DR

..5..

Copy to:

1. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Hyderabad South East Division, Hyderabad.
2. The Director Postal Services, Hyderabad City Region, Hyderabad.
3. The Chief Post Master General, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr.P.Rathaiah, Advocate,CAT,Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.N.V.Raghava Reddy,Addl.CGSC,CAT,Hyderabad.
6. One copy to HBSJP,M(J),CAT,Hyderabad.
7. One copy to D.R(A),CAT,Hyderabad.
8. One duplicate copy.

YLKR

19/1/98

(8)

IL Const

TYPED BY
COMPAKED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND
R. Rangarajan

THE HON'BLE MR. JUDGE GENERAL PRASAD M(A)

DATED: 31-12-1997

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in

O.A.No. 465/95

T.A.No.

(W.R)

Admitted and Interim directions
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with direction

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal
प्रेषण/DESPATCH
12 JAN 1998
हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ
HYDERABAD BENCH