



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

O.A. No. 1583/2015

New Delhi, this the 2nd day of March, 2020

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

Bhagwat Singh,
Age about 56 years,
Assistant Sub Inspector, No.4523/D,
S/o Shri Badan Singh,
R/o 161, Type-II, Police Colony,
Ashok Vihar, Delhi-110052.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

Commissioner of Police,
Delhi Police,
Police Headquarters,
Inderprastha Estate, ITO,
New Delhi.

.. Respondent

(By Advocate : Mrs. Harvinder Oberoi with
Shri G.D. Chawla)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

The applicant was working as ASI in the Delhi Police. Disciplinary proceedings were initiated against him on 12.02.2010, alleging that one Shri Chandan Sharma @ Ganja, a notorious criminal, was arrested



with a cash of Rs.1.08 lacs and jewelry was recovered from him, but the applicant has taken Rs. 50,000/- as illegal gratification, to help the criminal. The applicant denied the charge. The departmental inquiry was conducted in accordance with the prescribed procedure. The charge was held proved, and a copy of the report of the Inquiry Officer was made available to the applicant. On a consideration of the representation submitted by the applicant, the Disciplinary Authority passed an order dated 01.10.2011, imposing the punishment of 'Withholding of one increment, for a period of one year temporarily'. Aggrieved by that, the applicant availed the remedy of appeal and the same was rejected through an order dated 29.04.2014. Hence, this O.A.

2. The applicant raised several grounds in the O.A. in his challenge to the impugned order. The respondents have filed a detailed counter affidavit opposing the O.A.

3. The O.A. has undergone several adjournments in the recent past itself. There is no representation for the applicant. The record discloses that the applicant was



56 years old, when the O.A. was filed and, obviously, because he is retired from service as of now, he is not exhibiting interest in pursuing the O.A. We heard Mrs. Harvinder Oberoi, learned counsel for the respondents.

4. We have perused the record to examine whether there was any deviation from the prescribed procedure and whether the applicant was denied opportunity. Every step was scrupulously followed, and we do not find any deviation from the prescribed procedure in the entire process. The punishment itself was very meager compared to the charge that is proved against the applicant.

5. We do not find any merit in the O.A. and, accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/jyoti/