

15

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.1848/2002

New Delhi this the 9th day of April, 2003

Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Shri V.K.Majotra, Member (A)

1. Shri D.K.Sabharwal
S/O Shri K.L.Sabharwal,
Chief Booking Supervisor,
Railway Station New Delhi
2. Shri Shiv Dutt Sharma,
S/O Shri K.L.Sharma,
Booking Supervisor, Railway
Station, New Delhi.
3. Shri R.P.Agarwal,
S/O Shri R.B.Agarwal,
Head Booking Supervisor,
New Delhi Rly. Station.
4. Shri Subhash Chander Jhamb,
S/O Shri Krishan Jhamb,
Booking Supervisor, Tilak
Bridge, New Delhi.
5. Shri Ramesh Chander,
S/O Shri Putti Lal
Booking Supervisor,
N.Rly. Station, NZM, New Delhi.
6. Shri Dev Dutt Sharma,
S/O Shri K.L.Sharma,
Booking Supervisor,
N.Rly.S.S.M.NDLS.
7. Sh.Anil Kumar Patari,
S/O Shri Rangi Lal
Booking Supervisor
under S.S.Nizamuddin.
8. Shri Jai Singh
S/O Shri Sakwa,
Booking Supervisor,
S.S.Baraut.
9. Sh.Ram Karan Chauhan,
S/O Shri Heera Lal,
Booking Supervisor,
SSM, NDLS.

(By Advocate Shri B.S.Mainee)

VERSUS

Applicants

Union of India: Through

1. The General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House, New Delhi.

16

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Northern Railway, State
Entry Road, New Delhi.
3. The Divisional Commercial Manager(G),
Northern Railway, DRM Office,
New Delhi.

(By Advocate Shri Rajeev Bansal)

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)

This application has been filed by nine applicants who are working at different stations in Delhi Division. According to them, the respondents suddenly issued a notice debiting a heavy amount of Rs.54,234.55/- against each of the applicants, allegedly on account of loss of Self Printing Ticket Machine (SPTM) rolls. According to them, this notice was issued to them on the ground that during the period when they were working there, the SPTM rolls were allegedly lost.

2. When the case was taken up for hearing, both the learned counsel have submitted that other than the nine applicants, one more applicant had filed a separate Original Application (OA 2406/2002) which was disposed of by order dated 10.3.2003, copy placed on record. Learned counsel for the parties have also submitted that as the incident in question was the same with regard to the applicants in both the OAs and the orders imugned in the OAs are also the same, the Tribunal's order dated 10.3.2003 is applicable to the facts of this case.

3. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we reiterate the reasoning of the judgment of the Tribunal dated 10.3.2003 in OA 2406/2002 in the present case also and accordingly the present OA is allowed. The impugned order dated 14.5.2002 is quashed and set aside. However, liberty is granted to the respondents to initiate fresh proceedings to take action in accordance with law, if so advised. If any recovery had been made from the present applicants in pursuance of the aforesaid impugned order, which we have quashed, the status quo ante may be maintained and the amounts so deducted shall be refunded to the applicants within four months from today.

No order as to costs.

Majotra

(V.K.Majotra)
Member (A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman (J)

sk