

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.No.2287/97

(13)
VOL(J)

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy, ^{VOL(J)}
Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 11th day of July, 2000

Shri Ghanshyam Dass
s/o Late Shri Mool Chand Lalawat
r/o A-2/16, Sec 16, Rohini
Delhi - 85. Applicant

(By Shri S.K.Gupta, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Union of India through
Secretary
Ministry of Defence
South Block
New Delhi.
2. Director General
(Research and Development)
D.R.D.O. Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Vigilance
West Block No.8
Wing No.5, IInd Floor
R.K.Puram
New Delhi.
3. Shri B.N.Mehra
Enquiry Officer
c/o Director General
(Research & Development)
D.R.D.O. Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Vigilance
West Block No.8, Wing No.6
IInd Floor, R.K.Puram
New Delhi. Respondents

(By Shri R.V.Sinha, Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

By Reddy. J.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the respondents. The applicant while he was working as Junior Scientific Officer in the Defence Research and Development Organisation, Defence Institute of Fire Research (M/o Defence), he was alleged to ^{have} defrauded the Government by claiming Rs.4,440/- on account of Leave Travel Concession for the purported journey from Delhi to Kanyakumari and

Q8

14

back without actually performing the journey. As the applicant denied the allegations, the disciplinary proceedings under Rule 14 of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 were initiated against him. The enquiry officer relying upon the documentary evidence found the charge as proved. Thereupon the disciplinary authority, agreeing with the findings of the enquiry officer imposed the penalty of withholding of two increments for a period of four years with cumulative effect by the impugned order dated 12.1.1996. The said order was confirmed by the appellate authority by order dated 6.3.1997. The OA is filed challenging the above orders of penalty.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that OAs No.608/97 and 609/97 which were filed on the same allegations ^{had} ~~had~~ been ^{allowed} ~~decided~~ in a common order dated 28.6.2000 by the Bench comprising of both of us. The learned counsel for the respondents also fairly submits that the above OAs ~~are~~ clearly covered the issue raised in this OA. Hence the OA is allowed. The impugned orders are quashed. No costs.

Shanta

(SMT. SHANTA SHAstry)
MEMBER(A)

Rajagopalreddy

(V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/RAO/