

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 1105 of 2013

- =====
1. The Union of India through Chief Postmaster General, Bihar Circle, Patna
 2. The Director Of Postal Services, Central Region Patna- 1 Department Of Post Office Of The Chief Postmaster General, Bihar Circle, Patna-1
 3. Chief Postmaster, Patna G.P.O., Department Of Post Patna- 1

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Shree Badan Singh Son of Late Nag Narayan Singh Assistant Postmaster
Patna G.P.O., Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

For the Petitioner/s : Ms Nivedita Nirvikar, CGC

For the Respondent/s : Mr Parashuram Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

And

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

5 04-02-2015

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner- Union of India through Department of Post & Telegraph, we are not inclined to interfere in the matter as the matter, to us, appears to be too trivial involving no issue of law.

A departmental proceeding was initiated against the private respondent who was Assistant Post Master at Patna GPO. Initially, in the departmental proceeding, the recommendation was of giving punishment of stoppage of three increments with cumulative effect but then the matter came up to the Central Administrative Tribunal (In short *the Tribunal*) where the

punishment was substantially reduced. This attained finality but again the matter was remanded and the matter again came up before the Tribunal where finally, punishment was substantially reduced to stoppage of increment for a period of five months till superannuation of the sole respondent. Again, the matter was taken up after remand by the Tribunal and this time, the Tribunal has reduced the punishment to stoppage of increment for three months till retirement. Thus effectively, what is under challenge is that instead of five months increment being stopped till retirement, the punishment stands reduced being three months stoppage. This, in our view, is too trivial a matter because ultimately the sole respondent would retire without the last few months increment and two months here or there would hardly make any difference.

In that view of the matter, we are not inclined to interfere. This application is dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

M.E.H./-

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

U		T	
---	--	---	--