

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No. 113/1994

New Delhi, dated the 18th January, 1994

Hon'ble Mr. N.V.Krishnan, Vice Chairman(A)

Hon'ble Mr. B.S. Hegde, Member(J)

Sh. Jai Shankar Manjhi,
H.No. 157-A,
Hamayun Pur Near Safdarjung Enclave,
New Delhi

(By Advocate Sh.M.Hussain,)

... Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances
and Pensions, New Delhi.

2. Staff Selection Commission, through
its Chairman,
Dept. of Personnel & Training,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and
Pension, Block No.12,
Kendriya Karyalaya Parisar, Lodi Road.

.. Respondents.

ORDER (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Sh. N.V.Krishnan, Vice Chairman, (A))

We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant. He is aggrieved by the charge sheet issued to him by the memo dated 1.12.1993 (Ann. I) alleging dishonest conduct by the applicant on 4.6.93 when he tried to tamper with the answer papers of one Sh. Krishan Kumar, a candidate for the Sub Inspector examination. It is alleged that an impersonator appeared in the examination in place of Krishan Kumar. To cover it up the applicant replaced the photo of the

impersonator with that of Krishan Kumar. The

applicant has challenged the charge-sheet on a number of grounds. We find no merit in them. He can give his reply and have his say in the Departmental Enquiry.

The learned counsel says the charge sheet is bad as it relies on an alleged confession which ^{is given} ~~what has been taken~~ under elusiveness. He also argues that if there is an admission, there is no need for any enquiry.

It is open to the applicant to accept or deny the charges. He can contend ^{end} that the confession was extorted from him. All this can be done in the Departmental Enquiry. Therefore, we do not find any merit in the O.A and refuse to interfere at this stage.

O.A. is therefore, dismissed at the admission stage.


181.94
(N.V. Krishnan)

Member (J)

Vice Chairman (A)

sk