

13

**In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi**

OA No. 1796/90

Date of decision: 27.04.93.

Shri R.K. Singhal

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through the
Director General (Works),
C.P.W.D., Nirman Bhawan, New
Delhi & Others

...Respondents

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

For the petitioner

In person.

For the respondents

None

Judgement (Oral)

The case of the petitioner is that he was communicated adverse remarks on his performance for the year 1.4.1987 to 27.2.1988. He represented against the said communication on 5.10.1988. The petitioner admits that the same has been disposed of by the respondents and he has received a communication sometime in December, 1990. The respondents in their counter-affidavit have also confirmed that the said representation was disposed of. His second grievance is that he has not been confirmed with effect from the due date. The respondents vide paragraph-4.8 of the counter-affidavit have submitted that he was considered for confirmation by the DPC but was not found fit vide order dated 26.2.1990. The communication to this effect was also sent to him. He has not made any representation against the said order. There are allegations of malafides against Respondent No.5, Executive Engineer, C.P.W.D., Dehradun. These have been categorically denied by the respondents

2

in paragraph-4.9 of the counter-affidavit. I do not find any reason not to accept the submissions of the respondents as made in the counter-affidavit.

2. In the above facts and circumstances of the case, I do not see any justification to interfere with the case. The O.A. is accordingly dismissed. No costs.


(I.K. Rasgotra)

Member (A)

San.