

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL**

W.P.(C) No. 845 of 2025

Md. Abdul Qudus

... Petitioner

- Versus -

Union of India & 4 Ors.

... Respondents

With
MC[W.P.(C)] No. 768 of 2025

B E F O R E
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. BIMOL SINGH

O R D E R
[M. Sundar, CJ]

17.10.2025

[1] Mr. Juno Rahaman, learned counsel for petitioner is before this Court.

[2] Captioned 'writ petition' ['W.P.', for the sake of brevity] has been presented in this Court on 16.10.2025 (yesterday) assailing an order dated 23.05.2025 made by Central Administrative Tribunal, Guwahati Bench (said 'CAT' for the sake of convenience and clarity) in 'O.A. No. 042/0026/2024' ('said application' for the sake of convenience and clarity) filed by writ petitioner before us.

[3] Writ petitioner before this Court filed said application before said CAT, *inter alia* assailing an order of suspension (to be noted,

suspension pending disciplinary proceedings) dated 08.12.2025', extension of the same on 06.03.2023 and 30.08.2023. An order *qua* quantum of subsistence allowance had also been assailed (to be noted, this order is dated 31.05.2023), a prayer was made to give direction to the effect that the writ petitioner/applicant may be permitted to rejoin duty immediately.

[4] In the afore-referred said application of writ petitioner, said CAT after hearing both sides, passed an order dated 23.05.2025, directing the respondents to conclude the 'inquiry/disciplinary proceedings', which shall be referred to as 'DP' for the sake of convenience within a period of 6 (six) months positively and made it abundantly clear with specificity that if the inquiry is not concluded within 6 (six) months, the suspension order will be deemed to be revoked.

[5] Mr. Juno Rahaman, learned counsel for petitioner contended that prolonged the suspension is bad, challenge before said CAT was challenge to suspension order but that aspect of the matter has not been looked into.

[6] The factual matrix in a nutshell is that the writ petitioner was working as Postal Assistant in Accounts Branch in Imphal Head Office in the Department of Posts, Government of India. The DP was commenced *qua* several illegalities and irregularities in the accounts branch. On the ground that, the writ petitioner may influence the inquiry and on the ground that the presence of the writ petitioner can cause the inquiry to be influenced suspension order dated 08.12.2022, bearing reference No. F-6/Md. Abdul

Qudus/PA/IP HO) (hereinafter referred to as 'said suspension order' for the sake of clarity) was passed by Director, Postal Services, Manipur Division Imphal, the 4th respondent before this Court by exercising powers vide Sub-Rule (1) (a) of Rule 10 of 'Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965' [hereinafter referred to as 'CCS (CCA Rules)'] for the sake of brevity.

[7] This Court, after hearing the learned counsel for the writ petitioner, is of the considered view that the captioned writ petition at this stage is wholly misconceived. The reasons is, the captioned writ petition has been presented before this Court on 16.10.2025. As already alluded to supra, the impugned order of said CAT fixed a time frame of 6 (six) months for conclusion of the DP, 6 (six) months from 23.05.2025 will lapse on 23.11.2025, which is barely 2 (two) days past 4 (four) weeks from today. In the impugned order, said CAT has made it clear that if DP is not concluded within 6 (six) months, the said suspension order will be deemed to be revoked. Therefore, in barely 4 (four) weeks 2(two) days from today, if the inquiry/DP is not concluded, the said suspension order will stand revoked. In fact, it will be deemed revocation of said suspension order.

[8] In this view of the matter, we are unable to appreciate the submission of learned counsel for the writ petitioner that the writ petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order of said CAT and that too by filing writ petition on 16.10.2025.

[9] On the aforesaid short point, we find that the captioned writ petition does not pass muster in the admission Board. The sequitur is, the captioned writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, the captioned miscellaneous application also perishes with the writ petition and the same is also dismissed. We refrain from imposing costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Bipin