

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA No.2626/2019

New Delhi, this the 4th day of October, 2019

**Hon'ble Justice Mr. L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

Dr. Tarun Kumar, Age 32
Designation Medical Officer, Group 'B'
Medical Officer
Posted at DCB Hospital, Delhi.
R/o Flat No.B-101, Genx Crossing Republic
Ghaziabad-201002
Uttar Pradesh. ...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri R.K. Shukla)

Vs.

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Through its Chief Secretary
Delhi Secretariat
I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
Delhi Secretariat
I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
3. The Hon'ble Lt. Governor of Delhi
6, Rajniwas Marg, Civil Lines, Delhi.
4. The Medical Supdt.
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Deep Chand Bandhu Hospital
Ashok Vihar, Delhi-110052.
5. Department of Health & Family Welfare
Koki Wala Bagh, Ashok Vihar, Phase-4
Delhi-110052.
Through Secretary. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Ms. Esha Mazumdar)

ORDER (ORAL)**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:-**

The applicant was appointed as Medical Officer in the Deep Chand Bandhu Hospital run by the Govt. of NCT of Delhi w.e.f. 02.10.2014 and was placed on probation. He contends that on account of certain problems, he wanted to submit his resignation and representation, in this behalf, was made on 09.08.2016. His grievance is that even while his resignation is pending, the respondents are trying to terminate his probation and are also not permitting him to discharge the duties.

2. Notice was ordered in the OA on 04.09.2019. Today, learned counsel for the respondents has placed before us, a copy of the order dated 12.07.2018 through which the services of the applicant were terminated w.e.f. 28.09.2017, on account of unauthorised absence.

3. We heard Shri R.K. Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel for the respondents.

4. The applicant was under the impression that he is still in service and made a prayer for permitting him to join duties along with other prayers. The fact remains that his services were terminated vide order dated 12.07.2018. If the applicant is so advised, he can pursue the remedies vis-a-vis the said order.

5. We, therefore, dismiss the OA as infructuous, leaving it open to the applicant to pursue the remedies vis-a-vis the order of termination.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member(A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/vb/