

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No. 105 of 1993  
New Delhi, dated this the 2<sup>nd</sup> JUNE 1998

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)  
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

Dr. S.B. Vasishtha,  
S/o Shri M.S. Vasishtha,  
R/o N-235, Type IV Quarter,  
Sector 8,  
R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi-110022.

.... APPLICANT

(Applicant in Person)

Versus

Union of India through  
the Secretary,  
Dept. of Agriculture & Coop.,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Krishi Bhawan,  
New Delhi.

.... RESPONDENT

(None appeared)

JUDGMENT

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

Applicant impugns respondents' order dated 14.12.92 ((Ann. A-1) reverting him to his parent organisation w.e.f. 15.1.93 after giving him one month's notice.

2. Applicant was appointed as Director (Ext. Trg.) in Dte. of Extension on deputation basis on UPSC's recommendations for a period of three years from the date he assumed charge of the post i.e. 15.11.91 or until further orders, whichever was earlier. Respondents in their reply state that as applicant's performance while on deputation was not satisfactory, they reverted him to his parent organisation by the impugned order.

(13)

3. We have heard applicant who argued his case in person. None appeared for respondents.

4. Applicant does not deny that no stay orders against reversion were issued in this case, and he reverted to his parent organisation upon issue of the impugned order. He contends that his work during the period of deputation was quite satisfactory and he was never informed that his work was not satisfactory. He also alleges that he became the victim of moves by certain persons to have him removed and grab the post.

5. We have considered the matter carefully. If applicant alleges malafide motives <sup>made</sup> against any one, that person should have been <sup>a</sup> party so that he could be given an opportunity to reply, but that has not been done. The impugned order is an order simpliciter and carries no stigma, and applicant has complied with the same. It is also well settled that a deputationist has no vested right to be absorbed on the deputation post. **In the instant case respondents reverted**

(A)

applicant to his parent organisation after giving him one month's notice and no legal infirmity can be detected in the impugned order to warrant our judicial interference.

6. The O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

A. Vedavalli

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)  
Member (J)

S. R. Adige

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

/GK/