

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.No.418/99

U

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)  
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 16th day of October, 2000

Ex. Constable (Driver) Phool Kumar  
No.1375/DAP  
S/o Shri Jage Ram  
R/o Vill.-Som Channa, P.S.-Sanpla  
District - Rohtak, Haryana. .... Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Sachin Chauhan proxy of Shri  
Shankar Raju)

Versus

1. Union of India through  
the Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block,  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Commissioner of Police,  
Police Headquarters,  
M.S.O. Building,  
New Delhi.
3. Sr. Addl. Commissioner of Police,  
A.P.&T, Police Headquarters,  
I.P.Estate, M.S.O. Building,  
New Delhi.
4. Dy. Commissioner of Police,  
2nd Bn, Kingsway Camp  
New Police Lines,  
Delhi. .... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mrs. Sumedha Sharma)

O.R.O.F.R (Oral)

By Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy:

Heard the counsel for the applicants and the  
respondents.

2. In this case ~~the notice issued~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~order~~ <sup>✓ Review</sup> ~~order~~ passed by the authority exercising the power of Review under Rule 25.B of the Delhi Police (Punishment and Appeal) Rules (for short the rules) ~~is~~ <sup>✓</sup> under challenge.

W

6

3. The Full Bench in Head Constable Rajpal Singh Vs. Union of India & Others (in OA No.77/97) & batch has taken the view that Rule 25.B of the rules is ultra vires and consequently struck it down.

4. In view of the above, the OA is ~~accordingly~~ allowed and the respondents are directed to reinstate the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order with all consequential benefits as per the rules on the subject. We do not order costs.

(GOVINDAN S. TAMPI)  
MEMBER(A)

*V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY*  
(V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY)  
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/RAO/