

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**



OA No.1775/2019

New Delhi, this the 9th day of December, 2019

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

Mahakar Singh Gurjar
(Mob. No.9891235929) Group B, Age 32 years,
Junior Engineer (Civil)
Central Public Works Department,
S/o Sh. Soran Singh,
R/o Village Dayalpur, PO Parikshit Garh,
Distt. Meerut (UP) 250406 - Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Lokesh Kumar Sharma)

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs,
Nirman Bhawan, Maulana Azad Road,
New Delhi-110011
2. Central Public Works Department (CPWD)
Through the Director General,
Nirman Bhawan, Maulana Azad Road,
New Delhi-110011
3. Sh. Prabhakar Singh,
Director Generarl
Central Public Works Department (CPWD)
Nirman Bhawan, Maulana Azad Road,
New Delhi-110011 - Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Hilal Haider with Ms. Aishwarya Dobhal)

: O R D E R (ORAL) :



Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant is working as Junior Engineer in the CPWD. Through an order dated 20.02.2019, he was placed under suspension and the same was extended on 17.05.2019. It is also stated that on account of suspension, the applicant was not considered for promotion to the post of Assistant Engineer (Civil) (AE). This OA is filed challenging the order of suspension as well as the action of the respondents in not promoting him to the post of AE. A prayer is also made to quash the disciplinary proceedings, referable to its peaceful demonstration held on 12.02.2019.

2. The respondents filed a counter affidavit, opposing the OA. It is stated that the suspension order against the applicant has since been revoked on 10.07.2019 and that he has also been promoted to AE on 24.07.2019.

3. We heard Sh. Lokesh Kumar Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Hilal Haider with Ms. Aishwarya Dobhal, learned counsel for the respondents.

4. Out of three reliefs sought in the OA, two are extended to him by the respondents. The suspension was revoked and the applicant was promoted. So far as the relief



pertaining to the alleged disciplinary proceedings is concerned, even according to the applicant, no charge memo has been issued to him. Therefore, the question of quashing the disciplinary proceedings does not arise.

5. Accordingly, the OA is closed as infructuous. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/1g/