

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH

NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 1187/92

Rajinder Kumar and another

Applicants

versus

Delhi Adm. and another

Respondents.

Hon. Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.  
Hon. Mr. Usha Savara, Adm. Member.

(Hon. Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.)

As the pleadings are complete, the case is being heard and decided finally. Special recruitment of candidates for the post of constable in Delhi police was held in Saharanpur and Rampur in the month of May, 1987. The vacancies were notified to Employment Exchange and a condition was imposed that the age of candidates should be between 18 to 21 years on or before 11.5.87 and 15.5.87 and that the candidates must be registered with any of the Employment Exchange in U.P. one month before 11.5.87 and 15.5.87 for recruitment at Saharanpur and Rampur respectively. It appears that these persons got recruitment and were appointed as Police Constable. Subsequently on screening it transpired that a number of the candidates have erased/tampered with the date of registration in the Employment Registration Card and accordingly the cards were sent for verification, to the Employment Officers and it was <sup>reported</sup> ~~found~~ that a number of candidates



8

/recruit constables managed to get the appointment by submitting bogus Employment Cards and had erased the date of registration and the services of the applicants/others were terminated.

2. It is not necessary to enter into the various pleas. According/<sup>to</sup>the applicants they were given employment after due verifixation, and their services have been terminated behind their back and that too without giving any notice. The applicants were entitled to certain protection and their services could not have been terminated in this manner. It was a case of misconduct, ~~It is true~~ <sup>and</sup> that without opportunity of hearing the services could not have been terminated. Accordingly this application deserves to be allowed. This Tribunal has also taken similar view in the case of Vinod Kumar vs. Delhi Administration and accordingly this application is allowed and the order dated 19.4.88 terminating the services of the applicants is quashed. The applicants will be taken back in service. The respondents may hold an enquiry after giving opporing to the applicants. No order as to costs. **M.P. is also disposed of** <sup>accordingly</sup>

*M. Savara*  
(MS. USHA SAVARA)  
ADM. MEMBER.

*U.C. Srivastava*  
(U.C. Srivastava)  
VICE CHAIRMAN.

Shakel/-

Dated 24.12.92