

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

O.A. No. 1715 of 1993

New Delhi, dated this the 6th April, 1999

Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)
Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminatha, Member (J)

Shri Jai Bhagwan,
S/o Shri Tuhi Ram,
Inspector, Delhi Police,
R/o Flat no. 288, Police Colony,
Ashok Vihar,
Delhi. Applicant

(None appeared)

Versus

1. Lt. Governor,
through Chief Secretary,
Delhi Administration, Delhi.
2. Commissioner of Police,
Police Headquarters,
M.S.O. Building, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi-110002.
3. Addl. Commissioner of Police (AP&Trg.),
Police Hqrs., MSO Building,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
4. The Principal,
Police Training School, Jharoda Kalan,
New delhi-110072. Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Vijay Pandita)

ORDER (Oral)

BY HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

Applicant impugns respondents' order dated 8.11.91 imposing a penalty of censure on him as well as the appellate order dated 3.7.92 (Ann. F) rejecting the appeal.

2. None appeared for applicant when the case was called out even on the second call.

2

3. This is a 1993 case and was listed at Sl. No.7 of the regular hearing list below which was the caption that cases of the year 1993 and earlier would not be adjourned. Shri Pandita appeared for respondents and has been heard.

4. Shri Pandita has pointed out that the order of censure would remain in force for only six months and would not hamper applicant's further promotion.

5. In the grounds taken by applicant he has alleged prejudice and bias on the part of respondents No.3 & 4; he has denied he was negligent or lax in the performance of his duty and contended that the impugned orders are illegal, arbitrary and non-speaking ones.

6. By order dated 15.4.91 (Ann. A-1) applicant and other officers were entrusted with proper supervision over cleanliness, maintenance and orderliness in various buildings when the Principal took a round of the campus on 10.5.91 he found the condition of the building entrusted to applicant far from satisfactory. Under the circumstance applicant cannot legitimately deny his responsibility in the matter and it cannot be said that there were no materials for respondents to come to the conclusion as contained in the impugned order.

7. No infirmity in the procedure adopted by the respondents leading upto the issue of the impugned orders have been highlighted in the

11

grounds taken in the O.A. which would warrant our judicial interference. Accordingly the O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

8. Later after the above orders were dictated in the open court, applicant's counsel Shri Samay Singh appeared.

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

Adige

(S.R. Adige)
Vice Chairman (A)

/GK/