

(19)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINIPAL BENCH~

RA 214/2001 in
OA 659/1999

New Delhi this the 18th day of February, 2002

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Union of India through
the Secretary,
Department of Telecommunications,
Govt. of India, New Delhi.

.. Applicants

(By Advocate Ms. Anuradha Priyadarshini)

VERSUS

Shri A.N. Singh
S/O Shri Ram Lakhan Singh
R/O A-36, Gali No. 3, Kabir Nagar,
Delhi-110094

.. Respondent

(Respondent present in person)

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

Shri H.C. Sharma, learned counsel for the original applicant was present earlier and had submitted an order issued by the respondents dated 18.12.2001, copy placed on record. Later when the case was taken up the applicant in OA 659/1999, Shri A.N. Singh was present in person. He has also relied on the same order passed by the respondents. In this order, it has been stated that after going through the charges framed against the applicant in OA (respondent in RA) and the evidence on record, that "there is little substance in the charges levelled against the officer".

2. We have heard Ms. Anuradha Priyadarshini, learned counsel for the applicants (original respondents) in RA 214/2001. Her contention is that

js -

this RA has been filed because another charge sheet issued against the applicant under Rule 16 of the CCS(CCA) Rules, 1965 which was pending when the order dated 2.10.2000 was pronounced in OA 659/1999 could not be brought to the notice of the Tribunal. Admittedly, that charge sheet has now been dropped by the aforesaid order dated 18.12.2001. Even otherwise, we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record or sufficient grounds under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC read with Section 22 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 to allow the RA. Apart from that, it is ^{also} noticed that it is also an admitted fact that the second charge sheet which was then pending under Rule 16 of the CCS(CCA) Rules, 1965 has also been dropped by the respondents by their letter dated 18.12.2001.

3. In view of the above facts, RA 214/2001 is rejected.

(Govindan S..Tampi)
Member (A)

sk

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman(J)