

(6)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

OA 1278/92

Date of decision: 23.4.1993

Shri Vinod Kumar

vs. Commissioner of Police, Delhi

For the applicant .. Shri A.S.Grewal, counsel  
For the respondents .. Shri Ravinder Dayal, counsel

JUDGEMENT(ORAL)

The application in this case is filed to:

" i) quash the oral orders passed by the respondents denying the applicant to the post of constable in Delhi Police and not allowing him to join the necessary training;

ii) direct the respondents to appoint him as a constable in Delhi police;

iii) set aside the Memo dated 16.3.91 cancelling the candidature of the applicant and also the rejection letter dated 10.12.91"

2. We have heard the 1d. counsel for the applicant.

3. Annexure A-2 is the Memo dated 16.3.91 stating that the applicant concealed the facts that he was involved in cases FIR No.223 dt. 7.9.84 u/s 342/325/34 IPC & 223 dt. 24.9.87 u/s 279/337 IPC and that the applicant adopted foul means for securing his candidature and hence his candidature was cancelled.

4. Annexure A-3 dated 4.6.91 is the reply to the applicant's father on the same lines.

5. We have heard the 1d. counsel for the respondents. We noticed that the applicant was involved in the crime as reported in the FIRs. In one case there was a compromise and

in another he was acquitted. That is not material. What is alleged in A-2 and A-3 and not denied is that the applicant concealed these facts, obviously, with the intention to see that these do not come to light on verification of his character and antecedents by the police. In the absence of any convincing reason for concealing the facts, we see that no *prima facie* case has been made by the applicant. Hence the application is dismissed.

*usky*  
(C.J.ROY)  
Member(J)

*krishnan*  
23.4.83  
(N.V.KRISHNAN)  
Vice-Chairman(A)