

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

RA No. 77/95 in
OA No. 215/95

New Delhi this the 29th Day of May, 1995.

(5)

Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman
Hon'ble Dr. A. Vedavalli, Member (J)

Chander Bhan,
Working as Constable in
Delhi Armed Police,
Kingsway Camp, ...Applicant
Delhi.

(By Advocate Sh. Shyam Babu)

Versus

1. Asstt. Commissioner of Police,
5th Bn. D.A.P., Kingsway Camp,
Delhi.

2. Addl. Commissioner of Police,
(AP&T), Police Headquarters,
I.P. Estate, ...Respondents
New Delhi.

ORDER (By circulation)
(Mr. N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman (A))

This application seeks a review of the order dated 31.1.95 by which OA-215/95 was dismissed at the admission stage. We have seen the Review Application and we are satisfied that it can be disposed of by circulation and we proceed to do so.

2. The Original Application was to challenge the penalty of censure imposed on the applicant in a disciplinary proceeding. This was in respect of a mistake committed by the applicant in handling a leave application. The fact that the mistake was committed is not in dispute. That being the case, we noticed that the appellate authority did not accept the submission made by the applicant that there was no malafide intention in verifying the leave

✓

application and that it was only a clerical mistake. Hence, we did not find any merit for interference and dismissed the OA. (6)

3. In the Review Application, the substance of the grounds stated is that the applicant could not have dealt with the leave application in any better manner and that, therefore, the imposition of the penalty is unjustified. This is no ground to justify a review. We only held that the appellate authority was justified in rejecting the appeal of the applicant. It was for the appellate authority to appreciate the reasons given by the applicant. As that authority has considered the matter but not accepted those pleas, it maintained the order of penalty. We, therefore, did not see any ground for interference. What is now stated does not disclose any error apparent on the face of record. Hence, there is no merit in the Review Application. It is dismissed.

A. Vedavalli
29/5/95

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)
Member(J)

'Sanju'

N. V. Krishnan
29/5/95

(N. V. Krishnan)
Vice-Chairman(A)