

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> day of October Two Thousand And Eighteen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)  
THE HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, MEMBER (J)

O.A./310/1348/2017

V. Deivasigamani,  
S/o. Vijayan  
Aged about 59 years  
83, II Main Road,  
Kaveri Nagar,  
Reddiyarpalayam,  
Puducherry- 605 010.. .....Applicant

(By Advocate : M/s. Sai Bharath & Illan)

VS.

1. Union of India Rep. by  
Chief Secretary to Government,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry;
2. The Secretary to Government,  
Department of Home Affairs,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry;
3. The Additional Secretary to Government (Home),  
Home Department,  
Government of Puducherry,  
Puducherry;
4. The Director General of Police,  
Puducherry. ....Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. R. Syed Mustafa)

**ORAL ORDER**

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member (A))

This OA is filed by the applicant seeking the following reliefs:-

"a) Call for the records on the file of the third respondent relating to the impugned order bearing Ref. No.11/AS/Home)/PS2017 dated 12.05.2017 and quash the same;  
b) Direct reinstatement of the applicant into service and  
c) award costs of the Original Application."

2. The applicant is aggrieved against the order of suspension which was issued against him on 12.05.2017 on certain charges. An interim order of stay was passed by this Tribunal on 20.09.2017.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant had been reinstated into service based on the interim order of the Tribunal and had also subsequently retired on superannuation on 31.08.2018. As it is now not possible to reinstate him into service, the OA has become infructuous.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents produces a copy of the instructions received by him in this regard which is taken on record. It is submitted that although the applicant had been reinstated into service in terms of the stay order of this Tribunal, the disciplinary proceedings against him are still in progress having been continued under Rule 9 of the CCS (CCA) Rules. The relevant charge memorandum had been issued three days prior to his date of superannuation, which fact, in any case is not relevant for the relief sought in this OA.

5. Keeping in view the above submissions, the OA is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

(P. MADHAVAN)  
MEMBER(J)

(R. RAMANUJAM)  
MEMBER(A)

asvs.

30.10.2018