

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. No.651/99

New Delhi this the 5th day of November, 1999

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MRS. SHANTA SHASTRY, MEMBER (A)

Dr. A.P. Saxena,
Son of Late Shri Ram Prakash Saxena,
R/o G-2, Green Park Extension,
New Delhi-110 016.

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri B.T. Kaul)

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through Secretary,
Department of Agril. Research and
Director General
Indian Council of Agril. Research.
Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Dr. A. Alam,
Dy. Director General (Engg.),
Indian Council of Agril. Research,
Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. Dr. S.L. Mehta,
Dy. Director General (Edu.),
Indian Council of Agril. Research,
Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi.
4. Dr. S.S. Tomar,
Asstt. Director General (ARIS),
Indian Council of Agril. Research,
Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi.

Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Ashok Kashyap)

ORDER (Oral)

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and
the respondents.

2. The main relief in this O.A. is to quash
of the Suspension Order dated 8.2.1999. It is the
grievance of the applicant that there is no substance
in the charges and that this is inordinate delay in

ca

2

completing. Hence the order of suspension should be revoked. He further contended that the applicant though entitled for 75% of the subsistence allowance. The learned counsel for the respondent however, submitted that the respondents would review the increase in the payment of the subsistence allowance in accordance with the rules. The learned counsel for the respondents also submits that the authorities would complete the inquiry within the shortest possible time.

3. At this stage, we are not inclined to go into the merits of the matter which have to be considered and decided in the inquiry. It is not in doubt that the applicant is entitled for subsistence allowance in accordance with the relevant rules. We direct the respondents to review increase of the payment of subsistence allowance in accordance with the Rule 53 (1)(a) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965.

4. We further direct the respondents to complete the inquiry and pass the final order in the inquiry within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is needless to say that applicant should cooperate in the inquiry.

5. Copy of this order to be given to both the counsel. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of.

Shanta Shastri
(Mrs. Shanta Shastri)
M(A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
VC (J)

M. K. Reddy