

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

OA No. 3126 /2012

New Delhi, this the 28th day of August, 2015

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.P. Katakey, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. P.K.Basu, Member (A)**

B.K. Gupta
S/o Shri Suraj Mal Vaish
Age 51 years
Senior Postmaster
711/40 Mathura Vihar
Roorkee, UttarakhandApplicant
(By Advocate: Mr.Padma Kr. S.)

Versus

- 1 Union of India; through
Secretary
Ministry of Communication and Information
Technology Dak Bhawan, New Delhi-1
2. Director General of Post
Department of Post
Dak Bhawan
Sansad Marg,
New Delhi -220116.
3. The Additional Director General (Vigilance-III)
Department Of Post
Dak Bhawan
Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-220116. ... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Gyanender Singh)

ORDER (ORAL)

By Justice Mr. B.P. Katakey, Member (J);-

The applicant has filed this OA seeking a direction to the respondent-authority to complete the disciplinary proceeding initiated vide the charge memorandum dated 1.4.2014, contending, inter-alia, that though the said charge memorandum was issued more than a year ago, the disciplinary authority has not

proceeded further, despite appointment of the IO and PO by the respondent-authority.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant, therefore, prays that the respondents may be directed to complete the disciplinary proceeding initiated against him within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos. 1,2 & 3 has submitted that since the disciplinary proceeding has been initiated against the applicant vide the charge memorandum dated 1.4.2014, the respondent-authority has to complete the same within a reasonable period of time. He further submits that at least five months time may be granted to complete the same.

4. We have heard Mr.Padma Kr. S, learned counsel appearing for the applicant and also heard Mr. Gyanender Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondents and also perused the pleadings available on the record in the OA. It is not in dispute that the charge memorandum was issued on 1.4.2014 and the applicant filed his written reply. It also appears from the pleadings that the disciplinary-authority being not satisfied with the written statement filed by the applicant, proceeded with the inquiry and as such, the IO and PO have been appointed on 11.08.2014.

5. Having regard to the fact that the disciplinary authority has initiated the disciplinary proceeding by issuing the charge memo on 1.4.2014 against the applicant, and appointed the IO and PO, we dispose of the present OA, directing the respondent-authority to complete the disciplinary Proceeding, initiated against the applicant, within the period of four months from

the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The applicant shall cooperate with such proceeding. Needless to say that if such proceeding has been delayed on account of the applicant, that time shall be added to the four months time. The OA stands disposed of.

(P.K.Basu)
Member (A)

(B.P. Katakey)
Member (J)

/mk/