

Any proceedings, which have been undertaken after the retirement becomes without any authority or jurisdiction and any order passed in pursuance to the said proceedings initiated or continued after retirement, without there being any provisions giving jurisdiction to an employer to the said effect, are nullity in law. Relevant paragraph of the said judgment is as under:-

“We also cannot accept the contention of Mr.Rao that in the case of Mata DeenGarg, the departmental proceedings could be kept pending despite the passing of the impugned order. The High Court had not passed any order in the departmental proceedings. It sought to invoke the jurisdiction which was conferred on the High Court and the State by reason of a statutory rule. A departmental proceeding can continue so long as the employee is in service. In the event, a disciplinary proceeding is kept pending by the employer the employee cannot be made to retire. There must exist specific provision in the pension rules in terms whereof, whole or a part of the pension can be withheld or withdrawn wherefor a proceeding has to be initiated. Furthermore, no rule has also been brought to our notice providing for continuation of such proceeding despite permitting the employee concerned to retire. In absence of such a proceeding, the High Court or the State cannot contend that the departmental proceedings against the appellant Mata DeenGarg could continue.”

*Chandra Singh v. State of Rajasthan and another*¹2003(3) SCT 694