

P

C.A.No. 5519-5520 OF 1997
ITEM No.111

COURT NO. 10

SECTION XII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 5519-5520 OF 1997@@
CC

SUPDT. OF POLICE ...APPELLANT

VERSUS

D. SELVARAJ & ANR. ...RESPONDENTS
(With office report)

Date : 04/03/2003 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVARAJ V. PATIL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARIJIT PASAYAT

For Appellant (s) Mr. A.T.M. Sampath, Adv.
Mr. V. Balaji, Adv.
Mr. P. N. Ramalingam, Adv.

For Respondent (s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

Heard learned counsel for the appellant for five minutes.

The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

.SP1
Sarita (Shelly Sengupta)
Court Master

(Signed order is placed on the file)

.PA
.PL56

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 5519-5520 OF 1997@@
CC

SUPDT. OF POLICE

... APPELLANT

VERSUS

D. SELVARAJ & ANR.

... RESPONDENTS

O R D E R@@
CCCCCCCC

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

The order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras is challenged in these appeals. The respondents, namely, D. Selvaraj and G. Selvaraj were kept under suspension on 18/1/1995. Subsequently, the orders of suspension were extended upto 18/7/1995 by the Additional Director General of Police. The Tribunal held that after the expiry of the period of suspension, the respondents were not reinstated and that the Additional Director General of Police was not competent to extend the period of suspension. In that view, the Tribunal passed interim stay of the suspension.

At the hearing, Mr. A.T.M. Sampath, learned counsel for the appellant pointed out that against D. Selvaraj fresh order of suspension was passed in the year 1996 having regard to the prosecution launched against him.

..2/-

.2.

In our view, whether the Additional Director General of Police was competent to extend the period of suspension or not, may not be necessary to be examined in these cases having regard to the passage of time; at any rate that period of suspension has come to an end on 18/7/1995. This being the position, in our view, these appeals have become infructuous. Hence the appeals are dismissed.

.SP1

.....J.
(Shivaraj V. Patil)

New Delhi,
March 4, 2003.

.....J.
(Arijit Pasayat)