

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 10245 OF 2015

ORDER:

None appears for the petitioner when the matter is called.

The petitioner, who is employed as a Development Officer (Administration) with the United India Insurance Company Limited, calls in question the order passed on 20.03.2015 by the 2nd respondent Divisional Manager placing him under suspension pending inquiry.

It appears, the petitioner earlier worked as the Development Officer (Admn.), In-charge of Micro Office of the 1st respondent at Markapur in Prakasam District. He also appears to have received appropriate commendation from the company for having rendered good quality services there. He appears to have achieved commendable results while working as an Administrative Officer at Markapur, but however, there appears to be an allegation, which has recently surfaced that two cheques bearing No. 355455 and 195000 with dates 02.04.2014 and 29.04.2014 drawn in a sum of Rs.39,975/- and Rs.47,310/- respectively have not been encashed and they were detected to be fake cheques. The petitioner was asked to explain the discrepancy in this regard by the notice issued to him on 17.11.2014 by the Divisional Manager at Rajahmundry to which office he has been transferred from Markapur on 06.06.2014. The petitioner has filed his explanation on 24.11.2014, but, to my mind, the explanation is non-committal. However, the petitioner seems to have made certain efforts to secure the statement from Andhra Bank with regard to the collection of various cheques and demand drafts during the months of April and May 2014 and he has filed the same to show that no cheque is outstanding for realization. It is one thing to say that no cheque is outstanding for realization and it is altogether a different thing to receive two cheques from the customers and not presenting them for collection at all. In case those instruments were presented for collection and if they were bounced or remained un-cleared, appropriate measures ought to have been taken. These are all questions, which can only come out during the course of inquiry.

Since the petitioner has now been placed under suspension, since he has filed his explanation and since it will not be advisable to keep an otherwise efficient

employee under suspension for prolonged periods, the 1st respondent is directed to complete the inquiry against the petitioner as expeditiously as is possible, strictly in accordance with the regulations framed by the 1st respondent in that regard within a maximum period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

With this, the Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, the miscellaneous applications, if any shall also stand disposed of.

NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO, J

10th April 2015

ksld