

M

**THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR  
ORDER SHEET**

APPLICATION NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant(s)

Respondent (s)

Advocate for Applicant (s)

Advocate for Respondent (s)

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

05-07-2011

OA. 235/2011

Mr. Punit Singhvi l.d. counsel for applicant.

Heard l.d. counsel for the applicant,  
the OA is disposed of by a separate  
order.

Anil Kumar  
(Anil Kumar)  
Member (A)

K.S. Rathore  
(Justice K.S. Rathore)  
Member (J)

11/7/11

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Jaipur Bench, JAIPUR

OA No.235/2011

This the 5th day of July, 2011

**Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Rathore, Member (Judicial)**  
**Hon'ble Shri Anil Kumar, Member (Administrative)**

V.C. Bunkar S/o Shri Gyarsilal, aged 58 years, r/o Manpura Machedi,  
Jaipur at present working as P.A. Shahpura HO (Jaipur) VPO Samod  
(Jaipur)

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Punit Singhvi)

**- VERSUS -**

1. Union of India represented through Secretary, Department of Posts, Minister for Communications and Information Technology, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi-110116.
2. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Department of Posts, Jaipur (MFL) DN, Jaipur -16.

.....Respondents

**ORDER (ORAL)**

Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

2. The main grievance of the applicant is the impugned order dated 22.7.2010 (Annexure A/1), whereby the said conviction has been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, Jaipur Bench, Jaipur S.B. Cr. Revision Petition No. 494/1995 dated 26.3.2009 and the applicant Sh. V.C.Bunkar, P.A. Shahpura HO has been acquitted from the criminal charge. On account of acquittal, the respondents set aside the order of dismissal from service and reinstate the applicant Shri V.C.Bunkar with immediate effect and post him as SPM Renwal. With this stipulation the intervening period, pay and allowances of the official will be decided separately.

3. The applicant without waiting the decision or without making any representation to this effect has filed this OA. The bare perusal of the order dated 22.7.2010 reveals that the intervening period, pay and allowances still pending for consideration. In our considered view the OA is premature. The applicant is at liberty to represent before the competent authority to this effect, it is for the competent authority to consider the same.



4. At this stage, we find no merit in the OA and the same stands dismissed as being premature.

*Anil Kumar*  
(Anil Kumar)  
Member (Administrative)

*K.S. Rathore*  
(Justice K.S. Rathore)  
Member (Judicial)

mk