Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench: New Delhi

O.A. No. 1603/2002 O.A. No. 1626/2002 O.A. No. 1653/2002

New Delhi this the 1815 day of November 2002

Hon'ble Shri M.P.Singh, Member (A) Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

O.A. No. 1603/2002

Kuldeep Kaul 273-C, Pocket II, Mayur Vihar, Phase I, Delhi-110 091 (India)

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.K. Sinha)

Versus

- 1. Ministry of Science & Technology Through its Secretary Anusandhan Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001.
- 2. Council of Scientific & Industrial Research Through its Director General Anusandhan Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110 001.
- 3. National Institute of Science Communication, (NISCOM) Dr. K.S. Krishan Marg, New Delhi-110 012.
- 4. V.K. Gupta, Director, National Institute of Science Communication (NISCOM) Dr. K.S., Krishnan Marg, New Delhi-110 012.
- 5. K.L. Jain Inquiry Officer, National Institute of Science Communication (NISCOM) Dr. K.S., Krishnan Marg, New Delhi-110 012. Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Manoj Chatterjee with Ms. K. Iyer)

O.A. No. 1626/2002

Dr. J.Sundaresan Pillai, F-62, CSIR Scientists Apartments,

10

Maharani Bagh, New Delhi-110 065

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.M. Garg)

Versus

- Counsel for Industrial & Scientific Research, Through its Director General, Anusandhan Bhawan Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110 001.
- 2. National Institute of Science Communication, Through its Director, Dr. K.S. Krishnan Marg, New Delhi-110 012.

K.L. Jain,
Inquiry Officer,
Through The Director,
National Institute of Science Communication,
Or. K.S. Krishnan Marg
New Delhi-110 012.
Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Manoj Chatterjee with Ms. K. Iyer)

O.A. No. 1653/2002

G.Chandrasekar, E-33 CSIE Scientist Apartment, Maharani Bagh, New Délhi-110065

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.M. Garg)

Versus .

- Counsel for Industrial & Scientific Research,
 Through its Director General,
 Anusandhan Bhawan
 Rafi Marg,
 New Delhi-110 001.
- National Institute of Science Communication, Through its Director, Dr. K.S. Krishnan Marg, New Delhi-110 012.
- 3. K.L. Jain,
 Inquiry Officer,
 Through The Director,
 National Institute of Science Communication,
 Or. K.S. Krishnan Marg
 New Delhi-110 012.
 Respondents

Ly

(By Advocate: Shri Manoj Chatterjee with Ms. K. Iyer)

ORDER

Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

As these three OAs are founded on common question of fact and law, they are being disposed of by this common order.

- 2. In all these OAs there has been a challenge to disciplinary proceedings at an inter-locutory stage. Relief is claimed for setting aside the disciplinary proceeding order against the applicants who had been working as Scientists in NISCOM under CSIR.
 - Before dealing with the issue, for proper 3. adjudication, brief facts are enumerated. In June, 1996 Joint Action Committee of NISCOM comprising of Workers Scientific Workers Association and CSIR Association was constituted. Applicants were members who have been placed under suspension. A meeting was held between the officer bearers and the Minister of where it has been decided to appoint one man fact finding committee headed by retired Secretary Sh. D.K. Sanghal. Suspension of the applicants was revoked on the basis of report of fact finding committee. Several officers the respondents have been indicted though the report was not made public but no action was taken on it. public interest litigation was filed before the High Delhi. Court of Thereafter the applicants and other



members of the JAC were placed under suspension disciplinary proceedings have been initiated. order dated 5.5.99 High Court of Delhi has directed take action on the report. At the instance of the women employees a criminal case was filed before Metropolitan Magistrate, which ultimately resulted า**้** ก discharge of the applicants whereupon through several OAs filed, the enquiry was kept in abeyance, but later on was re-opened as the High Court has ruled out that mere discharge would not preclude holding of a disciplinary proceeding. Applicants' request for supply of additional was directed to be considered. documents Application against the CWP was also rejected. Respondents disposed of the request of the applicants for supply of documents.

- 4. Through these OAs the proceedings, which are at an inter-locutory stage have been assailed mainly on the ground of bias, no misconduct, non-supply of the relevant documents, non-acceding to the request to change the enquiry officer and dropping the charges on which the applicants stood discharged from the criminal case. Several pronouncements of the Apex Court have been placed reliance to substantiate the plea.
- 5. We consider the OAs chronologically. In OA-1603/2002 it is contended that the chargesheet served upon the applicants basically includes the charges



pertaining to criminal case of using indecent language and threatening bodily harm and as the applicant has been discharged on the same charges he should not be proceeded in a disciplinary proceeding and for this learned counsel Sh. . S.K. Sinha, appearing for the applicant placed reliance on DOP&T OM dated 19.9.75 and the decision of Apex Court in Kundal Lal v. Delhi Administration, 1976 SC 133. Shri Sinha further states that AIR enquiry is vitiated by malafides and bias, the impugned order dated 6.5.2000 was passed by Sh. V.S. Gupta, against whom applicant has made a representation and he is tantamount to dismiss applicant from service from his letter dated 28.2.2002 addressed to and applicant it is contended that bias is real apparent on the face of it, as such in view of the decision of the Apex Court in State of Punjab v. V.K. Khanna, Civil Appeal No.6963/6964 of 2000 decided on 30.11.2000, disciplinary proceedings can be interfered at inter-locutory stage if malafides or bias are established at the outset.

6. It is further stated that the applicant has not been served upon the material documents, including the original complaint which has greatly prejudiced the applicant in his defence and this is not permissible in the light of the decision of the Apex Court in Chandramma Tiwari v. Union of India, 1987 (supp) SCC 518.

 \bigcup

In OA-1626/2002 and OA-1653/2002 Shri S.M. Garg, learned counsel appearing for the applicants states that the OAs do not suffer from res judicata as earlier OA-234/2000 was filed to seek quashment of chargesheet on the ground that Articles 2,3 and 4 were subject matter of FIR No.213/88 under Section 354 in which applicants were discharged by the Metropolitan Magistrate on 28.7.2000. The earlier OA was dismissed on the ground that article name of Bhardwaj and charge of entering the misbehaviour and intimidation is not covered by the CWP-7656/2001 filed in the OA พลร discharge order. 18.12.2000 where the decision of the disposed of regards continuation of disciplinary Tribunal as proceedings even after discharge in criminal case been upheld but the representation dated 7.2.2002 filed for dropping the charges 2,3 and 4 has been rejected on 7.2.2002.

8. Sh. Garg further states that in view of the decision of the Apex Court in Capt. M. Paul Anthony V. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. & Anr., JT 1999 (2) SC 456 discharge in a criminal case stand on a better footing than acquittal and as the prosecution has failed to connect them with the alleged offence holding disciplinary proceedings on the same ground is not

legally sustainable.



- Jain who was appointed as enquiry officer against whom a PIL was filed before the High Court, alleging correction and nepotism and the applicants being members of the Association which filed the PIL, an impartial enquiry by Sh. K.L. Jain cannot be accepted. As such they made a request for change of the enquiry officer as there was the real likelihood of bias and in view of the decision of the Apex Court in S. Parthasarthi v. State of Andhra Pradesh, 1974 (3) SCC 459, enquiry officer should have been changed. The request for change of enquiry officer has been rejected without any basis.
- 10. He has also assailed the proceedings account of non-suuply of additional documents. On his request of 221 additional documents only 79 have provided to the applicants but out of which 51 documents were not available. OA-2314/2001 was filed before Tribunal and by an order dated 11.10.2001 0A was On filing Writ Petition No.7562/2001 High dismissed. Court of Delhi by an order dated 18.12.2001 directed re-consideration of the request of the applicants for supply of relevant document which was rejected by order dated 21.2.2002. According to him these documents were very important for their defence and its non-supply has greatly prejudiced them, which is in violation principles of natural justice.



11. On the other hand, respondents' counsel strongly rebutted the contentions of the applicants and

the Tribunal interference of objected to inter-locutory stage in a disciplinary proceedings in the light of the decision of the Apex Court in <u>Union of India</u> V. Upendra Singh, (1994) 3 SCC 357. It is stated that the Tribunal is precluded from going into the sufficiency evidence and in absence of any malafide or misconduct applicants are adopting delaying tactics to linger on the enquiry without any reasonable basis and by repeated litigation which resulted in dismissal of the OAs the present OAs cannot be interfered at an inter-locutory He has also filed his written submissions and stage. stated that no bias is proved against the respondents and malafide is not a ground to interfere. In so far as the plea of proceeding on charges on which the applicants are discharged from the court of Metropolitan Magistrate is concerned, as the same has been held to be proper and affirmed by the High Court the same is no more res-integra and cannot be gone into in the present OA.

12. It is further stated that the respondents have passed reasoned orders to decline the request of the applicants to change Sh. K.L. Jain as enquiry officer.

Jan



- 13. In 0A-1653/2002 it is contended that earlier 0A-748/98 and 0A-3368/2001 have been disposed of as well as the grievance of documents was dealt with and rejected in 0A-3368/2001.
- 14. In OA-1603/2002 it is stated that it suffers from the vice of res-judicata and OA-1173/99 seeking revocation of suspension and quashment of proceedings for non-supply of documents was withdrawn. Furthermore, OA-2121/2000 to stay the disciplinary proceedings till criminal trial is over was also withdrawn. It is stated that in view of Section 11 of the CPC and in the light of the decision of the Apex Court in Lonankutty v. Thomman & Another, AIR 1976 SC 1645 these OAs are barred by the doctrine of res-judicata.
 - continuation of proceedings on the same charge on which the applicants have been discharged by the Metropolitan Magistrate is concerned, the same was justified in view of the decision of the trial court and findings of the High Court holding that the decision of the Tribunal to continue with the proceedings despite discharge has been upheld and in the light of the decision of the Apex Court in Nelson Motis v. Union of India, (1992) 4 SCC 711 as the scope of criminal case is entirely different from disciplinary proceedings order of acquittal would not

conclude the disciplinary proceedings. He further re-iterates his pleas on the basis of the decision of the Apex Court in <u>Senior Superintendent of Post Office</u>.

Pathnamthitta v. A. Gopalan, AIR 1999 SC 1514 as well as <u>State of A.P. v. Allabakash</u>, (2000) 10 SCC 177.

Accordingly the disciplinary proceedings have been held in addition to these charges apart from criminal proceedings.

concerned, High Court of Delhi in CWP-7656/2001 have directed the respondents to supply relevant documents except Sanghal Committee's report. As few of the documents filed by the applicant are not existing and some are irrelevant all the relevant documents have been served upon them and to this effect an order has been passed which would not constitute violation of principles of natural justice as only relevant and relied upon documents are to be served. Learned counsel relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in Syed Rahimuddin v. Director General, CSIR & Anr., AIR 2001 SC 2418 as well as Krishna Chand Tandon v. Union of India, AIR 2001 SC 2418, to substantiate his plea.

17. In so far as bias of the enquiry officer is concerned, which is taken as a common ground, it is contended that as Sh. K.L. Jain has been indicted by Sanghal Committee's report allegations of bias is only a

figment of the imagination of the applicants and is not reasonable and based on any documents. The same is founded on conjectures and surmises. Request of the applicants has been first rejected was again referred to the reviewing authority on their representation, but

finding no substance rejected the same. Moreover, it is stated that on the one hand enquiry officer's order to supply the document is supported, on the other hand bias is alleged, which cannot be allowed as no-one can be allowed to aprobate and reprobate on the same issue. Lastly on the basis of <u>Upendra Singh's</u> case (supra) it is contended that as the misconduct of the applicant is apparent on the face of it and the applicants have failed establish malafides or case of no evidence, interference at this inter-locutory stage is However, the applicants would be afforded permissible. reasonable opportunity to be to be defended in accordance with rules and instructions and procedure and if they are aggrieved by the final order they can resort to appropriate proceedings in accordance with law. It also stated that the apprehension that they would dismissed is neither well founded nor justified reasonable grounds.

18. We have carefully considered the rival contentions of the parties and perused the material on record. Before proceeding to adjudicate the legal issues, individual chart in all the three cases indicating the various litigation undertaken by the applicants is reproduced below:

Mr_



IN THE MATTER OF J.S. PILLAI

	<u> </u>	•
S. PETITION	RELIEF PRAYED	REMARKS
NO. NO.	At D	\$ 15 m
1. O.A. 748 / 1998	 (a) to quash the charge sheet on the ground of mala fides. (b) Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of Bias. (c) Revocation of suspension. 	The Hon'bie CAT by order dated 1 July 1998 held that: (a) The applicants have failed to make a ground interfere with the impugned chargesheets. (b) Merely because some accusations have been made against the Inquiry officer by the applicants, no bias has occassioned in this case. (c) A statutory remedy of filing an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. (at P. 113 - 118)
2. O.A. 2130 / 1998	To engage a practicing lawyer as defence assistant.	The Hon'ble CAT by order dated 18-5-1999 dismissed the petition.
3. CWP 3249/ 1999 in the High Court against the above order in O.A. 2130 / 1998.	lawyer as defence assistant	The Hon'ble by order allowed the writ with direction that. The applicant could engage a defense assistant furnished by him in his affidavit dated 5-6-1999 and with a direction to co-operate with the department to ensure expeditious disposal of the enquiry.
4. O.A. 2314 / 2000	(a) to quash the memo of charges in view of discharge in the criminal proceedings. (b) To quash the order of suspension and charge memo on the ground of malatides. (c) Quash the proceedings for non-supply of documents	 (a) the discharge order is by no means sufficient to quash the charge memo. (b) The charge memo is not contrary to law and cannot be gone into at the inter-locutory stage by the Tribunal. It can or cannot be established only during the course of disciplinary proceedings. (c) This is covered by rules,
	documents.	regulations and precedents and the same cannot be a ground to

	1.			
	· ·			interdict the proceedings at the inter-locutory stage (at P. 204-208)
5		CW 7656 / 2001 before the High Court against the order in above O.A. 2314 / 2000.	 (a) to quash disciplinary proceedings on the ground of dicharge in the criminal proceedings. (b) Enquiry against him was malafide and to be quashed. (c) Non-supply of doc. is prejudicial to his interest. 	The Hon'ble High Court by order dated 18-12-2001 held that: No infirmity with the Tribunal order in O.A. 2314 / 2000. (a) & (b) Discharge in the criminal case was not enough to do away with disciplinary proceedings. (c) The respondent was directed to supply copies relevant existing docum it, except Sangal Committee report. (at P. 209-211)
	6.	O.A. 76 / 2002	to quash the order dated 1-7-98 rejecting the request of applicant to change the enquiry officer on the ground of Bias.	The order dated 1-7-98 was quashed and the reviewing authority was directed to consider the application on the allegation of bias against the Inquiry officer. The disciplinary authority may also consider dropping articles of charge and pass suitable consider dropping articles. (at P. 215-217).
	7.	O.A. no. 1626 / 2002	(a) Order dated 15-2-2002 rejecting the reprsn. For change in Enquiry officer. (b) Order dated 7-2-2002 rejecting application to drop the charges. (c) Non-supply of documents. (d) Omission in deciding reprsn. Dated 20-1-2002 to revoke the suspension.	

25



IN THE MATTER OF G. CHANDRASEKHAR

1.	NO.	PETITION NO.	RELIEF PRAYED	REMARKS
1.		748 / 1998	(a) to quash the	The Hon'ble CAT by common
			charge sheet	order dated 1 July 1998 held
		, "	on the	that:
į.		4	ground of	(a) The applicants have failed
1:"			malafides.	to make ground to
: :			(b) Change of	interfere with the
† . † .	a visit de	A Complete	Inquiry	impugned chargesheets.
1.	1 1/2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		officer on the	e (b) Merely because some
l l			ground of	accusations have been
1			Bias.	made against the Inquiry
i		163.24	(c) Revocation	officer by the applicants,
† •			of	no bias has occassioned in
	• .		Suspension.	this case.
				(c) A statutory remedy of
				filing an appeal against the
	•	. ,		order of suspension have
	•	:		not been exhausted.
1				(at P. 113)
2.				(40.1.113)
ے.		O.A. 1293 /	To quash the	The Hon'ble CAT directed the
:		1999	departmental	respondent to supply the
			proceedings on	documents as prayed by the
	,		the ground of	and the and record the
		- 1	non-supply of	reason for non-supply of any
,			documents.	requested document.
3.				requested document.
٠.		Contempt	To initiate	The Hon'ble CAT dismissed
•		Petition	contempt action	the CP and held that the
			for non-	enquiry officer concluded that
			compliance with	the documents were not
			the above order.	available and there was no
				disobedience of the Tribunals
				order.
ļ.		OII III		TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY O
••		CWP. No. 2189	- man on Bring the	PENDING
	[/ 2002 by	recruitment	
		Association for	process of 21	
		advancement of	Scientists in	
		Science	NISCOM	



The second secon

(a) Quash the

The Hon'ble CAT by order dated 19 December 2001 held that as the issues have already been decided and the authority has passed reasoned order no directions as sought for can be given. If the documents are not available adverse inference can be drawn, but merely because the documents have not been supplied, we cannot restrain the department from holding the enquiry further. (at P. 80 - 84)

3368 / 2001 departmental proceedings. (b) quash the departmental proceedings on the ground of ground of non-supply of documents. O.A. 1656/ (a) to drop 2002 departmental proceedings in view of discharge in the criminal proceedings. (b) Representati on of bias . has not been properly decided. (c) Representati on for revocation of suspension has not been decided.

IN THE MATTER OF KULDEEP KAUI

S.NO. PETITION NO: 1. Q.A 748/1938 (a) to quash the chargesheer on the ground of malafides. (b) Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of malafides. (c) Revocation of Suspension. Suspension: (d) Revocation of Officer of the ground of make a ground to interfere with the chargesheer. (e) Revocation of Suspension. (e) Revocation of order of suspension. (f) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (g) To quash the proceedings for the CSIR Sciennife Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June. 2000 4. Q.A. 2121/1 to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings for the Crimbinal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings. (b) Po quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bass against the Inquiry officer.	S,N	0	DETERMINE		
Co. A. (48, 1998) (a) to quash the chargeshed natardes (b). Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of Bias (c). Revocation of Suspension. (a) Revocation of Suspension. (b) Engagement of practiciting lawyer as defense assistant (c). The Hobbe CAT by its order date of proceedings from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (c) To quash the proceedings for the Cast Suspension at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (d) CA. 2121/1 to direct the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (d) The Hobbe CAT by its order date applicantly no bias as occasions, in this case. (e) To quash the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee as a Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (e) To Suspension at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (f) The Hobbe CAT by order date of the Cast Suspension o	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		_ NO:	W. W. THE CONTRACTOR	REMARKS
chargesneed on the ground of malafides. (b) Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of malafides. (c) Revocation of Suspension. (c) Revocation of Suspension. (d) A suspension. 2. O.A. 1137/ (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (e) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the suspension of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ (a) Greet the Respondents not to proceedings from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ (a) Greet the departmental proceedings were stayed. (b) Completion of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in view of the dischar	- , ,	· .	O.A 748 / 19	98 (a) to quach the	
ground of malafides (b) Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of Bias (c) Revocation of Suspension. 2. O.A. 1137/ 1999 (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of Practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To qualk die procyeding for Non- supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report 3. O.A. 972/2000 Permission to defend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings (b) Population of Mated of 5. 2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against with a proceedings (c) Population of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings and the population of bias against with the connection of the criminal proceedings and the population of bias against with a proceedings (a) Population of the criminal proceedings and the population of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings and proceedings (b) 10 quash OM dated o-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against with a proceedings and the pled that the charges sheets (b) Merely beause some accustation to indeat the mack against the lengthy of the paging and accust the charges sheets (c) Astatic in Proceedings (c) Astatic in Proceedings (d) Astatic in Proceedings (a) Astatic in Proceedings (a) Proceedings (a) Proceedings (a) Proceedings (b) 10 quash OM dated o-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the sector of the criminal completion of the criminal proceedings (b) 10 quash of the proceedings (c) Proceedings (a) Proceedings (a) Proceedings (b) 10 quash OM (c) Proceedings (c) Proceedings (c) Proceedings (d) Proceedings (d) Proceedings (d) Proceedings (d) Proceedings (d) Proceedings (d) Procee				TWOOLA LIIG	The Heable CAT by common
(a) The applicants have falled to make a ground to interfere with of Bias (b) Change of Inquiry officer or the ground of Bias (c) Revocation of Suspension. (d) Revocation of Suspension. (e) Revocation of Order of Suspension. (a) Revocation of Order of Suspension. (b) Engagement of Practicity Invyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonssupply of documents including the Sanghal Committee report. (d) Premission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (d) O.A. 2121/1 to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) The Horbie CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horbie CAT by order dated 129-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horbie CAT allowed the petition of the criminal proceedings in view of the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) In quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bus against as a supplied to the completion of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) In quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bus against the surface with the decide a representation of bus against the same falled to make a ground to interfer with the maching in the charges hers. (d) Merely because some accustains as against the length of the required against the length of the participant with the maching against the length of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) A 1137/ (a) Revocation of order of supplicants the tength of the participant have falled to make a ground to the acquired against the length of the applicant, no bists against the length of the participant against the service with the maching the proceedings. (b) A 200 Premission of the proceedings and the proceedings against the service of supplicant				chargesheet on the	order dated 1 Til. 1000
(b) Change of Inquiry officer on the ground of Bias (c) Revocation of Suspension: (c) Revocation of Suspension: (d) Revocation of Suspension: (e) Revocation of Suspension: (f) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant; (c) To quash the proceedings of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (g) Permission (glattend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (g) CA, 2121/to direct the Respondents not to proceedings fill the perition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (h) Merely because some accusations who bas has consistent and applicant, to be a proceeding should be a possible of disciplinary proceedings. (h) Merely because some accusations who bas against those orders which have no been exhausted. The Hobble CAT by its order dated to twithdraw the petition of the twithdraw the petition of the completion of the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hobble CAT by order dated 259-52000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hobble CAT by order dated 259-52000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hobble CAT by order dated 259-52000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hobble CAT by order dated 259-52000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hobble CAT by order dated 259-52000 allowed the Petitioner to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (at P. 86 of _ic Counter) The Departmental proceedings are proceedings in view of the discharge in view of th			. Second	ground of malafia	hat
of Bias (c) Revocation of Suspension. (c) Revocation of Suspension. (d) Revocation of Suspension. (e) Revocation of Suspension. (f) Revocation of Suspension. (g) Revocation of order of suspension. (h) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (g) To Quasi the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghat committee report. (g) To Quasi the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghat committee report. (g) To Quasi the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghat committee report. (g) To Quasi the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghat committee report. (g) To Quasi the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghat committee report. (g) To Quasi the proceeding of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. (h) To direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings were stayed. The Horlbie CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (h) Po quasi OM dated of 5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bus against and pour decides a representation of busing against and proceedings.	More Tax		Allen Grant Sand	(b) Change of Inquiry	The state of the s
(e) Revocation of Suspension. (b) Merely because some accusations have been made against the Inquiry officer by the applicant; no bigs have been made against the Inquiry officer by the applicant; no bigs have been made against the Inquiry officer by the applicant; no bigs have been of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceedings of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ 2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings in view of the disciplinary proceedings. 5. O.A. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings (b) Merely because some accusations have been made against the Inquiry officer by the applicant, no his association as appeal against the Inquiry officer by the applicant, no big sale against the Inquiry of filling as appeal a		- 1.		Officer on the	make a ground to interform
(c) Revocation of Suspension. (d) Merely because some accessations have been made against the linquiry officer by the applicants no bias has cocassions in this case. (e) A staty ty remedy of filling an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. (f) To quash the practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (g) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (g) Proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee. The Horbie CAT by order dated 22-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (g) A staty ty remedy of filling an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. The Horbie CAT by order dated 22-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (g) A staty ty remedy of filling an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. The Horbie CAT by order dated 22-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Departmental proceedings the Horbie CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (g) A staty ty remedy of filling an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. The Horbie CAT by order dated 22-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Departmental proceedings the Horbie CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) 10 quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bus against the part of the completion of the counter) the petition of the criminal proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (a) the proceedings the counter of the criminal proceedings are proceedings. (b) 10 quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of the proceedings.				of District grou	W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W
Suspension. Suspension. Suspension. Cassions in this case. (c) A state, vi, remedy of filing an appeal against the nose orders which have not been exhausted. Charactering lawyer as defense assistant. (d) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. Completion of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. 4. O.A. 2121 / To direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residency in a disciplinary can only decide a representation of the bas against the bas against the search of the spansor of the completion of the criminal proceedings. Residence of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary and proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence in a representation of the bas against those orders which have not been exhausted. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence in a representation of bas against those orders which have not been exhausted. Completion of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary approached the pattion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary approached the pattion of the criminal proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence and proceedings. (c) A state, virendly office against those orders which have not been exhausted to withdraw the petition. (a) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition. (a) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition of the rection of the own the proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence and the proceedings. (c) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition of the rection of the petition of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (c) A 1215-2001 allo	;	ł		Of Dias	(b) Merely bear
Suspension. Suspension. Suspension. Cassions in this case. (c) A state, vi, remedy of filing an appeal against the nose orders which have not been exhausted. Charactering lawyer as defense assistant. (d) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. Completion of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. 4. O.A. 2121 / To direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residency in a disciplinary can only decide a representation of the bas against the bas against the search of the spansor of the completion of the criminal proceedings. Residence of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary and proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence in a representation of the bas against those orders which have not been exhausted. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence in a representation of bas against those orders which have not been exhausted. Completion of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary approached the pattion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary approached the pattion of the criminal proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence and proceedings. (c) A state, virendly office against those orders which have not been exhausted to withdraw the petition. (a) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition. (a) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition of the rection of the own the proceedings. (b) I o quash OM dated o.5-2002 as Residence and the proceedings. (c) The Hobble CAT by order dated to withdraw the petition of the rection of the petition of the completion of the criminal proceedings. (c) A 1215-2001 allo	[(c) Revocation of	of the some
genis the inquiry officer by the applicancy no bias has occasional in this case. (c) A stary by remedy of filling an appeal against those orders which have not been exhausted. The Hoble CAT by its order dated to whitdraw the petition of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quasi the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972/2000 Permission teatend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangatore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) 10 quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of proceedings and proceedings of the counter).	1		· OFTE	Suspension	accusations have been made
2. O.A. 1137 / (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceedings for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972 / 2000 Permission to lattend the Annual-Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangatore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121 / to direct the Respondents not to proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the discharge in virininal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias as appearance in this case. (c) A stap by remedy of filling at appearance which have not been exhausted. The Hobble CAT by is order dated 21-5-2001 allowed the Petitioner to withdraw the petition of the attendance to withdraw after the completion of the permission to be withdrawn after the completion of the oriminal proceedings. (a) to drop the discharge in virininal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the pagins the stage of the completion of the proceedings.	j	- 1			against the Induity officer b
2 O.A. 11377 (a) Revocation of order of supension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To guash the procycling for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report 3. OA 972/2000 Permission to lattend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 14. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603/2002 (a) to drop the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To guash Me Permission to lattend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 14. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings were stayed. The Hortble CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Hortble CAT by order dated 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting 29:55:2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend t		j.	i est eq		the applicants no bicate
2 O.A. 1137 / (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3 OA 972 / 2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121 / to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the disciplinary proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the samples of red as a representation of bias against the swinch have not been exhausted. The Horbie CAT by order dated 21-5-200 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Departmental proceedings were stayed. The Departmental proceedings were stayed. The Horbie CAT by order dated 22-5-200 allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) P. 86 of _c Counter)		- 1			Occassion of the Alexander
2. O.A. 1137 / (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsuspi) of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (d) Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. (e) A. 2121 / to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the better the strains and the proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the better to a short the which the decided a representation of bias against the better the complete to a short to proceed the criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the complete to withdraw the petition of the complete to withdraw the petition of the criminal proceedings. (c) A. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the complete the complete the complete to withdraw the petition. (at Page 87 of the Counter)		- 1			Color in this case.
2. O.A. 1137 / (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsuspi) of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (d) Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. (e) A. 2121 / to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the better the strains and the proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the better to a short the which the decided a representation of bias against the better the complete to a short to proceed the criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the complete to withdraw the petition of the complete to withdraw the petition of the criminal proceedings. (c) A. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the complete the complete the complete to withdraw the petition. (at Page 87 of the Counter)	į				state by remedy of filing ar
2 O.A. 1137/ (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3 OA 972/2000 Permission to lattend the Annual-Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings fill the completion of the criminal proceedings (a) to drop-the discharge in criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop-the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of the biss against the	•	- 1		바람이 그 그 그 그 그는 것이다.	Presidenti fose ordere
2 O.A. 1137/ 1999 (a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3 OA 972/2000 Permission to attend the Annual-Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4 O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. O.A. 1200 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) The Horble CAT by its order dated 21-5-2001 allowed the Petitioner to withdraw the petition. (at Page 87 of the Counter) The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Horble CAT-by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting.	ļ	}	140.001.1800.000		Which have not been
C.A. 1137 / 1999 Can Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. The Houble CAT by its order dated to withdraw the petition (at Page 87 of the Counter)		. !		1	exhausted.
(a) Revocation of order of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3 OA 972 (2000 Permission to attend the Annual-Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121 to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings fill the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings (b) To quash OM dated of 5-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of the bias against the	2.	10) 1127		1 1 1
Of suspension. (b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972/2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings fill the criminal proceedings will the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the bias against t		1	7.74. 113//	(a) Revocation of our	
(b) Engagement of practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee Ganghal C		4. 4	999 -	of suspensis	
practicing lawyer as defense assistant (c) To quash the Proceeding for Nonsupply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972 / 2000 Permission to lattend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121 / 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the			'	(b) Farmer	- I
practicing lawyer as defense assistant. (c) To quash the proceedings for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (d) Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (a) O.A. 2121 / 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) D.A. 2121 / 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (a) to quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the			*	Engagement of	to withdraw it.
defense assistant. (C) To quash the proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (B) Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 (A) O.A. 2121/ to direct the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (C) To quash of the proceedings for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. (B) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (C) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (C) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting. (E) The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the meeting at the date of a to attend the		. .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	practicing lawyer as	Corp. O Petition.
CO To quash the	11	ورويع أريان	and the second s	defense necierone	("Lage 87 of the Counter)
Proceeding for Non-supply of documents including the Sanghal committee report. 3	J. A	Has	a na see an wall	(c) To analysis tall	
James 1 (a) Departmental proceedings till the criminal proceedings in view of the disciplinary proceedings. S. O.A. 1603 / 2002 Sanghal committee report. Sanghal committee report. Sanghal committee report. The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Honble CAT by order dated 29-5-2000 allowed the Petitioner to attend the meeting. The Departmental proceedings were stayed. The Honble CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	1 5 At 1.5		Transfer to the state of	al > Anasii me	
Sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972/2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the criminal proceedings in view of the disciplinary proceedings. 5. O.A. (a) to drop-the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the				Proceeding for Non-	
Sanghal committee report. 3	1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	or o		Supply of document	
Sanghal committee report. 3. OA 972/2000 Permission to attend the Annual-Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000. 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bus against the banging the completion of bus against the base against the banging the completion of the proceedings.	ا در در در دولیون کی جام الرکد پرهٔ دما جیم در در در در		100	including	
CA 972 / 2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4				earline me	
CA 972 / 2000 Permission to attend the Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4				gangnal committee	
Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	in the first of the first	301.02		report.	
Annual Council meeting of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	3	- 7	A THE PARTY OF THE	A Committee of the state of the	
of the CSIR Scientific Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121 2000 to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	2 4 4 5 C 4 5 C	\$4 5.06	19/2/2000	Permission to accomp	
4. O.A. 2121 to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the Completion of the criminal proceedings (at P. 86 of ite Counter) 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop-the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the analyse of the disciplinary to bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of bias against the contact the authority can only decide a representation of the authori		7 - A		Annual Control the	The Hon'ble CAT by
Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the			A soldy Bally half	Council meeting	29-5-2000 allow 111
Workers Association at Bangalore from 1 to 3 June, 2000 4. O.A. 2121/ to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	√6 . ∦	. †		The USIR Scientific	to attend the retitioner
June, 2000 14. O.A. 2121 / 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	1 . : *	1	1. 18. 18. 18. 18.	1 WORKERS Association	actional tile meeting.
4. O.A. 2121 / 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		.] '		Bangalore from 1 to 2	
4. O.A. 21217 2000 Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the Completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	-	.]		June 2000	
to direct the Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the				1	
Respondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings were stayed. The Honbie CAT allowed the petition to be withdrawn after the completion of the criminal proceedings. Completion of the criminal proceedings. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	4,	0.7	1 2121 /	-	
Tespondents not to proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	1	200	0	to direct the	The
proceed with the departmental proceedings till the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	}	1	19 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	Respondents not to	The Departmental proceedings
departmental proceedings till the completion of the completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	l·	1		proceed with the	
completion of the criminal proceedings. 5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		1 .	•	deputational	The Hon'ble CAT alla
completion of the criminal proceedings O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the				acpartmental	petition to be allowed the
completion of the criminal proceedings O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		- Constitution of the Cons	ar baseou a termination of the	proceedings till the	T TO THE PARTY OF
5. O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the			***************************************	A COMPANY OF THE PARTY OF THE P	ompletion of the criminal
O.A. 1603 / 2002 (a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	,		1、 《电谱》	completion of the	Droom
(a) to drop the disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	5.	0 4		Criminal proceedings	proceedings.
disciplinary proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		1.00	; , 1	(a) to drop the	(at P. 86 of the Country)
proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		100	3 / 2002 4 []	diediation	(and the second
proceedings in view of the discharge in criminal proceedings. (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the			1 1 1 1 1 1	or scibiliary	The state of the s
criminal proceedings (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	,		一 医抗球虫	proceedings in via	· 医皮肤 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
proceedings (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the		,	o a marin II.	of the discharge	N. Shiring and Committee of the
proceedings (b) To quash OM dated 6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	12.1		- 1. 1885 P. VI	criminal de in	The state of the s
6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	12.50	'	a salas	DELVANARIA	1. 大學 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
6-5-2002 as Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	July 1 . go			(by hoccedings.	(1) #### (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1) ## (1)
Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	1.		二年列級制。	(V) 10 Quash OM down	William Control
Reviewing authority can only decide a representation of bias against the	Saying SE	و المراجعة		U-0-2-2002 acc	A STATE OF THE STA
representation of bits against the	PERCENT.		"二本管制的原	Reviewing	
representation of bias against the				authority	The first of the second of the
tepresentation of bias against the	to the second			out only decide a	and the second second
1. Compared to the second of	Elizaber II	1, 1	二十	representation of	Sugar Service Services Services
Inquiry officer.	A Section 1		- 计器能对于	bius apainessi	The state of the s
Tolliny officer.	Terri de			Inquise Co.	The state of the s
			. See West T	- duny officer.	
The second secon	7			The state of the s	and the same of th
	· ·		and the second s	the state of the s	The same and the s



19. As crystalised by various pronouncements of the Apex Court and more particularly <u>Upendra Singh's</u> case (subra) the interference of the Tribunal disciplinary proceeding at an inter-locutory stage i < permissible only when the case established is no misconduct and the charges framed are contrary to any law. The truth or correctness of the charge cannot gone into. In the light of the aforesaid contentions the first ground taken by the applicants as to continuance of the proceedings on the same charge on which they stood exonerated at the charge stage by the Metropolitan Magistrate is concerned, we find that in FIR No.213/92 under Section 354 IPC the Trial Court has discharged the applicants. Having challenged the proceedings before this court in 0A-2121/2000 it has been held that proceedings despite discharge can be continued. The aforesaid decision was carried to the High Court of Delhi in CWP-7656/2001 and by an order dated 18.12.2001 the observations of the Tribunal were upheld and it was also held that discharge of the petitioners in the criminal was not enough to do away with the disciplinary proceedings, as other charges have been surviving against Moreover, discharge cannot be placed on the same footing as acquittal in a criminal case. discharge the evidence and the material cited in support the chargesheet is not scrutinized by the trial court and no evidence takes place. It is only on acquittal on merits which can be done away with the proceedings as the finding of the quasi-judicial authority has to give way to the finding of judicial finding of the judicial court. case of Paul Anthony (supra) would have The application in such circumstances. Moreover, apart from criminal case there are other charges of misbehaviour and

M

26

assault, which are independent of the criminal trial and as such the enquiry can be gone into. In Nelson Motis's case (supra) the following observations have been made:

"So far as the first point is concerned, namely whether the disciplinary proceedings could be continued in the face of acquittal of the appellant in the criminal case, the plea has no substance whatsoever and does not merit a detailed consideration. The nature and scope of a criminal case are very different from those of a departmental disciplinary proceeding and an order of acquittal, therfore, cannot conclude the departmental proceedings."

Further in <u>Gopalan's</u> case (supra) the Apex Court has held as follows:

"In that case the court has rejected the contention that Disciplinary proceedings not to be continued in the face of acquittal in the criminal case and has held that the nature and scope of the criminal case are different from those of a departmental proceeding and an order of acquittal, therefore, can not conclude the departmental proceedings."

20. In <u>Union of India & Anr. V. Bihari Lal</u>
Sidhana, (1997) 4 SCC 385 held that it is true that the respondent was acquitted by the Criminal Court but acquittal does not automatically give him the right to be reinstated into the service.

is distinct from discharge. In discharge a trial can be conducted again on the same charges. As the finding of the Tribunal is upheld by the High Court regarding continuance of proceedings on the same charges on which applicants have been discharged and the same is no more res-integra. On the basis of the decisions cited above, we are of the view that the charge—sheet does not deserve to be quashed on this ground.

22. so far as supply of documents concerned, as 23 documents were existing and the defence documents have already been allowed by the enquiring authority to be available for inspection, non-supply of these documents cannot be sufficient to set aside the proceedings as the Sanghal Committee's report was not made public and other documents have been served upon applicants. In so far as documents which are not available the same have not been served upon applicants. Moreover, if the applicants has any grievance regarding non-supply of the documents, it would be a valid ground of challenge to the ultimate order passed by the respondents. Only because the documents have not been supplied the enquiry cannot be installed. The documents which are not placed reliance in the enquiry proceedings need not be supplied to the applicants. Petition negarding supply of Sanghal Committee's report has been dismissed by the High Court of Delhi that irrelevant documents have not been served upon applicants and the material documents available with the respondents have already been served and inspection allowed in view of the decision of the Apex Court in <u>Syed Rahimuddin's</u> case (supra), we do not find any infirmity or the grounds justifiable to warrant our interference at this stage in the disciplinary proceedings.

23. A specific ground has been laid down in OA-1603/2002 of alleged malafides. Shri Sinha states that a conspiracy has been hatched against the applicant, as he was member of the JAC is concerned, the impugned order passed by V.S. Gupta who was indicted is not maintainable as he is not likely to get any justice from the disciplinary authority being biased, it is stated of the disciplinary authority being biased, it is stated of the disciplinary authority being biased.



Controller enquiry officer was Jain, Administration it is apprehended that there would be a likelihood of bias on his part and he would not act independently. It is contended by the respondents that the bias is only a figment of their imagination, as, first of all, Sanghal Committee's report is not public and moreover during the relevant period enquiry officer was posted at Orissa. Mere vague apprehension would not be enough to establish bias. Circumstances would be such that a reasonable man would think probable about the prejudice. Enquiry was stayed on his request and subsequently on the direction of the Tribunal the matter has been reconsidered by the reviewing authority and his request for change of enquiry officer has been rejected. Apex Court in Parthasarthi's case (supra) held that "the Inquiry Officer appointed for conducting an Inquiry against the Government Officer should be free from bias. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further held that there must be a 'real likelihood' of bias and that means there must be a substantial bias."

- 25. Moreover in <u>G. Nageswara Rao v. State of</u> A.P., 1960 (1) SCR 580 the Apex Court has further held that if a member of job is subject to a bias in favour of, or against, in party to a dispute, or in such a position that a bias must be assumed to exist, he ought not take part in the decision or sit in the Tribunal.
- 26. We have perused the documents, including the orders passed by the respondents, rejecting the request of the applicants for change of enquiry officer.

 The Apex Court in Indrani Bai v. Union of India, 1994

 SCC (L&S) 981 has held as follows:

D



While issuing notice to the respondents, directed the respondents to place before us entire record. A counter-affidavit has been filed and record also has been placed before us. In fairness, Shri Kailash Yasdev, learned counsel the Union of India, having gone through the record, has placed necessary material us. As seen from the narration of the entire that after the direction was issued by the before Director General in his letter dated 26.9.1981, the enquiry officer had not recalled the ex parte order dated 14.12.1981 and 30.9.1981 cross-examination nor had given him an opportunity to adduce his evidence in rebuttal. On the other it is clear from the letter extracted hereinbefore that despite the direction issued by the higher authorities, the enquiry officer directed the delinquent to submit written brief, in other words, he proceeded from the stage where he last closed the proceedings. That was not the spirit of the order of the Director General. Thus, it is a clear case of the violation of principles of natural justice. It is seen that the delinquent officer entertained a doubt about the impartiality of the right enquiry to be conducted by the enquiry officer. When he made a representation at the earliest, requesting to change the enquiry officer, the authorities should have acceded to the request and appointed another enquiry officer, other than the one whose objectivity was doubted. Unfortunately, the Director after General had given an opportunity to the delinquent Even that was not done. to participate in the enquiry, the enquiry officer obviously was expected to recall the ex parte order and given the delinquent an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses already examined and to adduce his evidence in rebuttal. However, the enquiry officer did not adopt the said procedure which would have been just, fair and reasonable.

27. Moreover, the Apex Court in <u>Registrar of</u>

<u>Cooperative Society v. F.X. Fernendo</u>, 1994 SCC (L&S)

756 has held as follows:

"17. Then again the finding that there is long delay in initiating of departmental proceedings cannot be supported because in this case the Directorate of Vigilance and Anti-corruption had not been prompt. Therefore, the appellant cannot be faulted. Accordingly, we set aside the order of the Tribunal and direct the matter be proceeded

S2

with from the stage at which it was left. It is a settled principle of law that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done. Therefore, we would direct that another Enquiry Officer be appointed in order to remove any apprehension of bias on the part of respondent. The civil appeal will stand allowed with no cost."

It is irresistible from the rulings cited that in the event delinquent official apprehends bias against the enquiry officer and more particularly when he is directly or indirectly involved himself in the case as apparent from the material that the applicants were instrumental in keeping the various officers posted in different organisations of CSIR being indicted in Sanghal Committee's report where K.L. Jain, enquiry officer was also one of the controller, there exists a real apprehension of bias against him. Moreover, if there is a likelihood of bias in order to have impartial enquiry the enquiry officer should changed and more particularly when the request has been made by the applicants at the outset of the proceedings. Rejection of request without passing a speaking order is also not tenable in the eye of law.

29. As the enquiry officer has not been changed despite request of the applicants and the request is rejected summarily without assigning any reasons even after the directions in Pillai's (OA No.1626/2002) case in OA No.76/2002 the same is not sustainable in the eye of law.

Mr

partly allow these OAs without interfering with the chargesheets issued to the applicants on several other grounds and set aside the orders rejecting the request of the applicants for change of enquiry officer. the respondents are directed to change the enquiry officer Sh. K.L. Jain and appoint another enquiry officer within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The applicants are also directed not to include in vexatious proceedings and to sincerely cooperate in the proceedings. However, liberty is accorded to them to approach this court if they are aggrieved by any final

31. Interim orders passed in these cases are hereby vacated.

exhaustation of the remedies available to them, in

order passed in the disciplinary proceedings

accordance with law. No costs.

A copy of this order be placed in the case file of each case.

(Shanker Raju) Member (J)

(M.P. Singh) Member (A)

'San.'

ATTESTED
True Copy

I and and a

(TJS SANDHU) Lourt Officer

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, Faridket Housa

New Delhi-110001