

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 645 of 1996

Allahabad this the 30th day of August, 2000

Hon'ble Mr. S. K. I. Naqvi, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. M. P. Singh, Member (A)

Surendra Kumar, aged about 27 years, S/o Late  
Geetam Singh, Village Manshya Kala, Sadabad,  
Mathura (U.P.)

Applicant

By Advocate Shri Rakesh Verma

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,  
Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer(Cons.),  
Northern Railway, Kashmiri Gate, Delhi.
3. The Senior Civil Engineer, C (I), Northern  
Railway, Lucknow.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Prashant Mathur

O R D E R (Oral)

BY Hon'ble Mr. S. K. I. Naqvi, Member (J)

Shri Rakesh Verma, learned counsel for  
the applicant has confined his arguments only to  
the effect that the orders passed by the discipli-  
nary authority, copy of which has been annexed  
as annexure A-1 to the O.A. and the order passed  
by the appellate authority, copy of which has been

annexed as annexure R.A.-II with the rejoinder, are non-speaking, cursory and without giving reasons for having arrived at a conclusion through which the services of the applicant have been dismissed after due disciplinary inquiry, in which it was found that the applicant secured illegal appointment letter and got himself engaged as casual labour (new face) S.E.N.(D), Kanpur by manipulating a forged letter purporting to have been issued by CE/(C)/Kashmiri Gate, Delhi's letter No.E-254/G/N/spl./CL, dated 19.01.1989. *The annexure A-1 and R.A II have been assigned in this ER*

2. Heard, the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

3. Shri Prashant Mathur, learned counsel for the respondents made available to us file of DAR inquiry proceedings against the applicant- Shri Surendra Kumar.

4. We find that the Inquiry Officer came to conclusion that the letter dated 19.1.1989 allegedly issued by C.E(C), Kashmiri Gate, New Delhi, was not a genuine document and the appointment of the applicant in pursuance of this letter was of nullity. The disciplinary authority did not find any reason to disagree with this inquiry report and the obvious order in these circumstances followed by dismissing the services of the applicant.



5. So far as appellate order is concerned, the applicant has filed only covering letter through which the decision taken by the appellate authority has been communicated to him, which is not the appellate order itself. We perused the appellate order as contained in the disciplinary proceedings record. We find that the order is well reasoned, containing the required details.

6. For the above, we find the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant is not sustainable. The O.A. is dismissed accordingly. No order as to costs.

Member (A)(

  
Member (J)

/M.M./