IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

O.A. 365/1996 Dated 16-2-1996

Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)
Hon'ble Sh.K.Muthukumar, Member (A)

Shri Krishan Pal Singh
S/o Sh.Tika Ram,
under Sr.Administrative Officer,
Ministry of Defence, Govt.of India,
New Delhi.

... Applicant.

(By Advocate Sh.C.M.Thapiyal)

Vs.

1. The Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
Govt.of India, South Block,New Delhi.

2. The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer,
Ministry of Defence,
C-II Hutment,
Dalhousie Road, New Delhi.

3. The Sr.Administrative Officer,
Ministry of Defence,
Govt.of India in the office of
Joint Secretary(Training)
and CAO C-II Hutments,
Dalhousie Road, New Delhi.

... Respondents.

ORDER (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

This application has been filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act challenging the order dated 27.12.1995 issued by the respondents terminating the services of the applicant as casual labourer with effect from the date of expiry of one month from the date of receipt of this order.(Ann.A.1).

2. Learned counsel had read Ann.A.1 order. Learned counsel submits that at the time when the applicant's name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange in 1984 there was no requirement of any educational qualifications prescribed in the relevant rules. However, learned counsel admits that the applicant has given a false educational

3

certificate. He further submits that a proper enquiry has not been conducted by the respondents before passing the impugned order dated 27-12-1995.

3. We have carefully considered the averments and arguments of the learned counsel.

4. Im view of the fact, that there is an admission on the part of the applicant that he had produced false certificate/at the instance of somebody/ though he states else and had applied for the same, we find no merit in this application. The arguments of the learned counsel for the applicant that since he is/a poor person and has to support a large family, therefore, his lapses may be condoned cannot be accepted.

5. We also find from the impugned order dated 27-12-1995 that reasonable opportunity has been granted to the applicant to defend his case. In view of the facts that he has admitted furnishing/a false certificate, the decision of the competent authority to terminate his services cannot be faulted.

6. In view of the above facts, this O.A. is dismissed at the admission stage.

(K.Muthukumar)
Member (A)

(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

sk