

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NUMBER 425 OF 1997

ALLAHABAD, THIS THE 22nd DAY OF OCTOBER, 2003

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.R.K. TRIVEDI, V.C.
HON'BLE MR. D. R. TIWARI, MEMBER (A)

Veer Singh aged about 36 years
son of Shri Khandhi Singh
F/O-A-138 Bishwa Bank Barra,
Kanpur.

.....Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri R.K. Nigam)

V E R S U S

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Defence Hd. Qrs. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. Chairman, Ordnance Factory Board, 10-A, Auckland Road, Calcutta-700 001.
3. The Lt. Director Vig. Ordnance Factory Board, 10-A Auckland Road, Calcutta-700 001.

.....Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Ashok Mohiley)

O R D E R

BY HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.R.K. TRIVEDI, V.C.

By this O.A. filed under section 19 of Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has challenged the order dated 05.06.1996(Annexure-I) by which disciplinary authority awarded penalty to applicant ^{by} ~~by~~ reduction of ^{his} pay by two stages from Rs.1260/- to Rs.1200/- in the time scale of pay Rs.1200/-

.....2/-

// 2 //

to Rs.1800/- for a period of one year with cumulative effect with effect from 05.06.1996. The disciplinary authority further directed that the applicant will not earn increments of pay during the period of reduction and that on the expiry of this period, the reduction will have the effect of postponing his future increments. The aforesaid order was challenged in appeal, which has been dismissed by order dated 22.11.1996, which has also been challenged.

2. The facts of the case are that applicant at the relevant time was serving as Fitter General in Field Gun Factory, Kanpur. He was served with ~~the~~ memo of charge dated 07.03.1994, which contained allegations that he left his section unauthorisedly without any permission and went to MMM section to forcibly recover money from Shri Victor and indulged in altercation with Shri Victor which led to scuffle with him and thus created a scene and indiscipline. The inquiry was conducted. The inquiry officer found that the charges against the applicant were fully proved. The applicant was given opportunity to file representation against the report of the enquiry officer. The disciplinary authority agreed with the report of the inquiry officer and punished the applicant as stated above, which has been maintained in appeal.

3. In our opinion, for the misconduct, which has been proved, the punishment awarded is justified and does not call for any interference by this Tribunal. The O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.

Dhan
A. M.

V.C.