CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL CHANDIGARH BENCH

OA No. 060/00686/2014

Date of decision- 06.04.2016

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, MEMBER (A)

Dr. Anand Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Govt. College of Art, Sector 10, Chandigarh.

...APPLICANT

BY ADVOCATE: Sh. S.S. Pathania

VERSUS

- Union of India through Secretary Ministry of Human Resource
 Development (Department of Education), Shastri Bhawan,
 New Delhi.
- 2. Chandigarh Administration through Secretary Technical Education, Union Territory, Chandigarh.
- 3. All India Council of Technical Education, 7th Floor, Chander Lok Building, Janpath, New Delhi-110001.
- 4. Union Rublic Service Commission, Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi through its Secretary.
- 5. Sh. Manohar Lal, Acting Principal, Govt. College of Art, Sector 10, Chandigarh.
- 6. Dr. S.S. Dahiya, Director State Council of Education and Research Training, Sector 32, Chandigarh & Acting Principal, Govt. College of Art, Sector 10, Chandigarh.

...RESPONDENTS

BY ADVOCATE: Sh. H.S. Sullar, counsel for respondent no. 2.
Sh. Ashok Sharma, counsel for respondent no. 3.
Sh. B.B. Sharma, counsel for respondent no. 4.
Sh. Rohit Seth, counsel for respondent no. 5.
None for respondent no. 6.

HON'BLE MR. SANJËEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Challenge in this O.A is to the order whereby the official

respondents have given charge of acting Principal to respondent

no. 5.

2. Sh. H.S. Sullar, counsel for contesting respondent no. 2

submitted that the present O.A has become in-fructuous as

respondent no. 5 i.e. Manohar Lal, is no longer acting Principal

with them. He also apprised this court that after completion of

period, another person was given charge of Principal whose

appointment was challenged in O.A. No. 060/01164/2014 titled

Manohar Lal-Vs. U.O.I-& Orsa decided on 04 11.2015 wherein

impugned forder was quashed and set aside. Mr. Sullar,

submitted that there is no Principal working with Govt. College of

Arts and they will fill the vacant post as per the rule formulation,

therefore, the present O.A may be disposed of having been

rendered infructuous.

3. The learned counsel applicant did not dispute the factual

A COUNTY TO SEE

4. In view thereof, the present O.A is disposed of as having been

rendered in-fructuous.

Uday Kumar Parme

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA) (A) MEMBER

Dated: 06.04.2016

accuracy.

'jk'

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK) MEMBER (J)