

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

RA No. 337/94 in  
OA No. 855/94

New Delhi, this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1994

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member(J)

Sh. Madan Lal II  
S/o Sh. Ganga Ram  
R/o F-25/28  
Sector 3, Rohini  
Delhi

... Applicant

(BY Advocate : Sh. Mahesh Srivastava)

Vs.

1. Union of India through  
Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture  
Department of Food & Agriculture  
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi
2. Delhi Milk Scheme through  
General Manager  
West Patel Nagar  
New Delhi

... Respondents

(BY Advocate : Sh. Madhav Panikar)

ORDER  
-----

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma

The review applicant has sought review of the judgement dated 19th September, 1994 dismissing the Original Application where the applicant has prayed that the period of suspension from 11.10.80 to 11.8.88 be directed to be treated as period spent on duty with full pay and allowances and the salary of the applicant be fixed as per the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission and the applicant be paid arrears.

2. The matter of the applicant has been considered

on the basis of extant law. Even after the acquittal from the Criminal Court, the respondents are not barred from initiating departmental proceedings against the applicant. The respondents in their reply have clearly stated that the orders have been passed for initiating departmental proceedings, against the applicant. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the matter of payment of full pay and allowances for the suspension period, the suspension being because of a criminal case, in the case of Depot Manager of Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation,

<sup>(1994)27ATC p.4348</sup>  
Anumagunda Vs. V. Venkateswarulu it has been held that

on account of acquittal from the criminal case an employee is not automatically entitled to full salary for the period of suspension. The same view has been taken in the case of Management of RBI, New Delhi Vs. Bhupal Singh Ramchal reported in 1994 (1) SCC page 541.

In the case of the applicant the respondents have clearly observed that a specific order will be passed under FR 54.B after the conclusion of departmental enquiry contemplated against the applicant. Merely because the charge-sheet has not yet been served will not by itself entitle the applicant for treating of this period as spent on duty. All these points have been fully considered in the judgement under review except in the body of the judgement, there are some typographical mistake in page 2 of para 1 in the last

11 11  
fifth and sixth line of the judgement where the dates  
have been wrongly typed as 21.10.88 to 11.10.88 which  
has been corrected to 11.10.80 to 11.8.88. There is  
no error apparent on the face of the order. The review  
applicant has also moved MA 3469/94 that the RA be  
heard. But when there is no error apparent on the  
face of the judgement and all the contentions raised  
by the applicant has been duly considered in the light  
of the extant law, there is no case for hearing the  
RA in open court.

3. The RA is devoid of merit and is dismissed  
by circulation.

J. P. Sharma  
Member (J)

/ravi/