

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 56/93 & 43/93

199

T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION

16.12.98

Constable Pawan Kumar & Ors.

Petitioner

Sh. Ashok Aggarwal

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Respondent

U.O.I. & Ors.

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

Sh. Rajinder Pandita

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. T.N. Bhat, Member (J)

S.P. Biswas, Member (A)

The Hon'ble Mr.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? ✓ *VS*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

S. P. Biswas
(S.P. Biswas)
Member (A)

Cases referred:

1. M/s. Glaxo Laboratories (I) Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Meerut & Ors. (1984(1) SCC 1.
2. B.C. Chaturvedi Vs. U.O.I & Ors. (1995(5) SLR 77.
3. Hari Prakash Vs. U.O.I & Ors. (1998(2) CAT 464.
4. S.K. Singh Vs. Central Bank of India (1996(6) SCC 415.
5. Punjab State Civil Supplies Corp. Ltd. Chandigarh & Ors. Vs. Narinder Singh Nirdosh (1997(5) SCC 62.
6. Lord Buckmaster in T.B. Barrett Vs. African Products Ltd. (AIR 1928 PC 2611)
7. State Bank of Patiala Vs. S.K. Sharma (J.T. 1996(3) SC 722.

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

12

OA-36/93
with
OA-43/93

New Delhi this the 16th day of December, 1998.

Hon'ble Shri T.N. Bhat, Member (J)
Hon'ble Shri S.P. Biswas, Member (A)

OA-36/93

Constable Pawan Kumar
No. 4035-DAP, 5th Bn..
R/o V-241, Vijay Park.
Mauzpur, Shahdara, Applicant
Delhi.

(through Sh. Ashok Aggarwal, advocate)

versus

1. Delhi Administration.
through Chief Secretary.
5. Alipur Road.
Delhi.
2. The Commissioner of Police.
Delhi Police.
Head Quarters.
I.P. Estate, Delhi. Respondents

(through Sh. Rajinder Pandita, advocate)

OA-43/93

Constable Rajesh Kumar,
No. 4097-DAP, 5th Bn..
R/o H.No.A-26, Gali No.4.
Hardevpuri, 100 Foota Road.
Shahdara, Delhi-93. Applicant

(through Sh. Ashok Aggarwal, advocate)

versus

1. Delhi Administration.
through Chief Secretary.
5. Alipur Road.
Delhi.
2. The Commissioner of Police.
Delhi Police, Headquarters.
I.P. Estate, New Delhi. Respondents

(through Shri Rajinder Pandita, advocate)

3

ORDER

Hon'ble Shri S.P. Biswas, Member(A)

Both the O.As are being disposed of by a common order since they involve identical facts, reliefs and questions of law.

2. Applicants, Constables under the respondent Commissioner of Police Delhi, in these two original applications are challenging the legality of A-A orders dated 4.12.91 issued by the Appellate Authority rejecting their appeals against the order dated 30.4.91 whereby the punishment of forfeiture of 2 years of their approved services permanently have been imposed on them. Consequently, they have prayed for setting aside the impugned order dated 4.12.91 and also issuance of directions to respondents to provide all consequential benefits.

3. Brief description of the background facts is considered necessary for appreciation of the legal issues involved. Constable Rajesh Kumar alongwith Pawan Kumar were selected for training of dogs in explosive sniffing to be started w.e.f. 1.7.89 at B.S.F. Academy Takenpur/Gwalior (MP). They were medically examined by the Civil Surgeon/Civil Hospital Rajpur Road, Delhi and found fit for the purpose of the said training vide letter dated 30.6.89. Subsequently, both were directed to report to Principal/NTC for dogs, BSF Academy Takenpur on 8.7.89. Both the Constables reported at the above institution on 9.7.89 for undergoing the training from the scheduled date. However, both of them submitted an application on 15.7.89 at Takenpur stating therein that

they were not willing to undergo the said training course. Thus, they were returned back with directions to report back to DCP/C&R Headquarters vide order dated 28.7.89. Both of them reported their arrival back at Model Town Police Station/Delhi vide orders dated 29.7.89. In the background of the aforesaid details, both the officials were chargesheeted for the following:-

"Both of you never revealed your mind in this regard before proceeding to Takenpur otherwise the avoidable Govt. expenses that were incurred on training, could have been saved."

The above act on your part renders you both constables Pawan Kumar No.329/Crime and Rajesh Kumar No.170/Crime liable for action/punishment under Section 21 of DP Act 1978."

4. Proceedings against both the charged officials, with the change over of Enquiry Officers twice, were concluded with the findings as extracted below:-

"From the discussions above, statements of PW III&IV, evidence on record, the charge against both the defaulters Constable Pawan Kumar 327/Cr. and Rajesh Kumar 170/Cr. stands fully substantiated in that they wilfully committed gross misconduct, indiscipline and derelictions in the discharge of their official duties besides disobeying the orders of DCP/C&R."

5. Shri Ashok Aggarwal, learned counsel for the applicants seeks to challenge the aforesaid finding as well punishment on several grounds. He, however, intend to focus on the following four vital ones.

dp

(i) The charges against the applicant do not constitute a "misconduct". It is not a routine part of their duty which they have declined to work. All that the applicants would have lost by not taking the training is the incentive money that would have followed after the dogs training. Disobedience to carry out training is, therefore, not a violation of any rules/regulations.

Drawing strength from the decision of the Apex Court in the case of M/s Glaxo Laboratories(I) Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Meerut and Others (1984(1) SCC 1), the learned counsel argued that one could be punished only against the "misconduct" as per the charge memo and not otherwise. To add strength to this contention, he drew our attention to the following order of the Hon'ble Court in the above cited case:

"In short it cannot be left to the vagaries of management to say ex post facto that some acts of omission or commission nowhere found to be enumerated in the relevant standing order is none the less a misconduct not strictly falling within the enumerated misconduct in the relevant standing order but yet a misconduct for the purpose of imposing a penalty. Accordingly, the contention of Mr. Shanti Bhushan that some other act of misconduct which would per se be an act of misconduct though not enumerated in Standing Order 22 can be punished under Standing Order 23 must be rejected."

-5-

In view of the above order, the impugned order is without any jurisdiction and bad in law inasmuch as the alleged charges levelled against the applicants do not amount to misconduct, much less an enumerated misconduct under the service regulations. It has also been alleged that the conduct of the enquiry officer through out the enquiry was partial and adverse to the interest of the applicants. The enquiry officer has not conducted the departmental enquiry in an unbiased manner. On the contrary, he assumed the role of a prosecutor as well as an enquiry authority.

(ii) This is a case where the enquiry officer has held the charged officials responsible for something else than what has been alleged. The findings of the enquiry officer, as at page 29 of the paperbook, do not have any relation with the charges as at Annexure-D.

(iii) The punishment is highly disproportionate vis. the misconduct alleged. The forfeiture of two years of services permanently will have serious adverse consequences on the entire service career of the officials who had started their career only recently.

SP

-6-

(iv) The Disciplinary Authority has passed the order of punishment in a mechanical and casual manner. It is a case vitiated by non-application of the mind since findings of the enquiry officer are based on "no evidence "on record" as well as based on extraneous considerations. If the charge was of a loss to the National Exchequer, the quantum could have been worked out and the applicants asked to pay back the entire amount, if at all they had caused any loss of Revenue to the Government. the learned counsel for the applicants argued. It has also been argued that they were not be deputed to the training when the Principal of the Institute had earlier found them unsuitable.

6. Shri Rajinder Pandita, learned counsel for the respondents argued vehemently to say that misconduct on the part of the applicants stand proved. If at all they had no intention to proceed for the training, the applicants could have come out openly to refuse the same before making the movements. Drawing strength from the decision of the Apex Court in the case of B.C. Chaturvedi Vs. U.O.I. & Ors. (1995(5) SLR 778, as well as the O.A. decided by this Tribunal in the case of Hari Prakash Vs. U.O.I. through Delhi Administration & Ors.

(SLJ 1998 (2) CAT 464). Shri Pandita submitted that the Court/Tribunal in its power of judicial review are not to act as Appellate Authority to reappreciate the evidence and to arrive at its own independent finding. The Court/Tribunal may interfere where the proceedings held against the delinquent officer are, *inter alia*, inconsistent with the rules or in violation of the principle of natural justice or perverse. The learned counsel also submitted that disciplinary proceedings have been held in accordance with the rules and the applicants have been given reasonable opportunity to defend their cases. He relies on the judgement of the Apex Court in the case of S.K. Singh Vs. Central Bank of India, (1996(6) SCC 415). It has also been contended that the misconducts on the part of applicants are clear because of disobedience of legal orders. Normal penalty in such cases is dismissal from services. However, taking a lenient view as the applicants were new entrants, the Punishing Authority has awarded them the punishment of forfeiture of two years' permanent services which is justified and reasonable. It has been also denied that the Disciplinary Authority has passed the orders of punishment in a mechanical and casual manner. On the strength of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "Punjab State Civil Supplies Corpn. Ltd. Chandigarh & Ors. Vs Narinder Singh Nirdosh" (1997(5) SCC 62), the learned counsel argued that the Disciplinary Authority, on the basis of magnitude of the misconduct is empowered to impose punishment commensurate with the gravity of the misconduct. The nature of punishment has

19

to depend upon the magnitude of misconduct. Since the misconduct is grave one and the punishment of forfeiture of two years service, being a lenient one, the Tribunal may not be justified in interfering with the same.

7. We have carefully perused the records and heard the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties. The question, therefore, that arises for consideration is whether a delinquent official could be punished on an established "misconduct" that do not form part of the chargesheet. We are confronted herein with a situation where the charges established are not one of those framed. The finding of the enquiry officer in the present case is gross misconduct, indiscipline and dereliction in the discharge of official duties whereas the charge is that the applicants never revealed their mind before proceeding to Taktenpura resulting in avoidable Government expenses that were incurred on training and could have been avoided. We, therefore, find some force in the contention of the learned counsel for the applicants that the finding do not relate to the charges that were initially framed against the applicants. The applicants, therefore, had no opportunity to defend themselves against the charges which have been eventually established against them. For the purpose of imposing penalty, charges established must flow out of the charges framed and served. It cannot be left to the management to say ~~that~~ ex-post-facto that some of the acts of omissions or commissions stand proved though nowhere enumerated in the charge memo or in the statement of allegations (emphasis ours). As observed by

Lord Buckmaster in T.B. Barrett Vs. African

Products Ltd. (AIR 1928 PC 261) that no forms or proceedings should ever be permitted to exclude the presentation of a litigant's defence. We find that similar views in respect of principles of natural justice have been enunciated in State Bank of Patiala Vs. S.K. Sharma (JT 1996(3) SC 722 and those were to be adhered to render justice. The two cases on hand suffer from this legal infirmity.

8. Based on the detailed discussions aforesaid, we allow these Original Applications and quash the Appellate Orders dated 4.12.91 as at Annexure A, DCP/Crime & RIys' order of punishment of two years approved services permanently for two years as well as disciplinary proceedings shall stand quashed. The applicants shall be entitled for consequential benefits. We, however, make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion as regards the quantum of punishment imposed. Our orders, however, shall not stand in the way of the respondents to hold fresh proceedings against the applicants, if they are so advised.

No costs.

(S.P. Biswas)
Member (A)

(T.N. Bhat)
Member (J)

Attested
K. Sharad
16/12/98
C.O.C. III