



**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**OA No. 547/2021**

**This the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021**

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Robin Singh  
Aged 34 years, Group B  
S/o Shri Kush Pal Singh  
Junior Statistical Officer  
Sub-Regional Office, Nadiad  
Field Operations Division  
National Sample Survey Office  
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation  
Second Floor, Dalwadi Chambers  
PIG Road, Nadiad-387001.  
Resident of  
3, Ashutosh Bungalows, Indira Nagar  
Vaishali Road, Nadiad-387001  
e-mail ID-robinamu002@gmail.com

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Sh. Tushar Ranjan Mohanty)

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through  
The Chief Statistician of India and Secretary  
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation  
Sardar Patel Bhawan, Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Rakesh Kumar, ISS  
Director  
Through the Chief Statistician of India and Secretary  
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation  
Sardar Patel Bhawan, Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.



3. Deepak Verma, ISS  
Deputy Director  
Through the Chief Statistician of India and Secretary  
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation  
Sardar Patel Bhawan, Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.
4. R.P. Sharma  
Senior Statistical Officer  
Through the Chief Statistician of India and Secretary  
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation  
Sardar Patel Bhawan, Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. R.V. Sinha with Sh. Amit Sinha for R-1)

### **ORDER (Oral)**

#### **Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**

The applicant is working as Junior Statistical Officer in National Sample Survey Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. He filed this OA with a prayer to quash and set aside the Remarks in the Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR) for the year 2017-2018, in the Integrity Column.

2. The Reporting and Reviewing Officers indicated the integrity of the applicant as 'doubtful'. The Accepting Officer agreed with the same. Thereafter, the applicant made a representation to the Competent Authority. Through an order dated 17.07.2020, the Competent Authority informed the applicant that he agreed with the grading and remarks in the



APAR for the year 2017-2018 made by the Reporting and Reviewing Officers. The applicant filed this OA challenging the order dated 17.07.2020. He made extensive reference to OM of the Government, which prescribed procedure to be followed, for making entries about integrity. It is stated that the prescribed procedure was not followed.

3. We would have certainly examined the issue in detail after hearing the respondents. What has shocked the Tribunal is that not only the applicant has arrayed Reporting and Reviewing Officers as parties by name, as Respondent No. 3 and 4, but also made devastating remarks against Respondent No.4 in para 4.5 of the OA. The relevant portion reads as under:

“4.5. That the Applicant wishes to humbly submit here that the Adverse Entry that was given to the Applicant was by Respondent No. 4. Respondent No. 4 was the immediate Supervising Officer of the Applicant, but Respondent No. 4 is a **Goonda Element** and he once invited several Anti-Social Elements to the Office at Agra one day and pointed out the Applicant. He threatened the Applicant that he will ensure that the Applicant will be beaten brutally by his Hench Men and his future will be spoiled. The reason for this was that Respondent No. 4 was running a racket in the Office and collecting money from the Staff and other Organisations/Individuals connected with the Office, which was later being divided between the three Private Respondents, but the Applicant and a few others refused pay bribes and had to face the consequences. The impugned Annual Performance Appraisal Report of the Applicant for the year 2017-2018 (Annexure A-2) is one such action.” (Emphasis supplied)



4. Such insinuations have no place in the pleadings before a legal forum. Even if the applicant has no control on himself in making such remarks, that too against his superiors, the Advocate is required to be careful, and to avoid such unparliamentary and devastating comments against anyone. The Reporting or Reviewing Authorities are not only conferred with the power, but also are placed under the duty to reveal their views on the functioning of the officer, being reported. The applicant is literally blackmailing the superior officers in the Department for discharging their duties. The Tribunal cannot entertain an OA with such unparliamentary language and indisciplined comments against the superiors. We also take serious exception to the manner in which the OA was drafted by the learned counsel.

5. We dismiss the OA. We also leave it open to the fourth respondent in particular, and the department in general, to take necessary steps on the comments made by the applicant. No costs.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/lg/jyoti/ns/