



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

O.A. No. 1127/2021

This the 23rd day of September, 2021

Through Video Conferencing

**Hon'ble Ms. Manjula Das, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Dr. Rohit Chopra [Group – A, Higher Study]
S/o Late Shri Krishan Prakash Chopra
R/o, 122, E-II, Sector – 18,
Rohini, Delhi 110089
Phone : +91-8368520028
Email : drrohitchopra@rediffmail.com

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Ravi Kumar)

Versus

1. The Chairman,
Maulana Azad Institute of Dental Sciences,
(MAIDS), Fifth Floor,
Sachivalaya, New Delhi – 110002
E-mail : dpmaids@gmail.com
Phone : +91 – 11 – 23233925
2. The Chief Secretary
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Inderprastha Estate, Sachivalaya,
New Delhi – 110002
E-mail : ascgncd@gmail.com
Phone : +91 – 9868111799
3. Government of NCT of Delhi
Through : Secretary, Health & Family
Welfare Department, 9th Floor,
Inderprastha Estate, Sachivalaya,
New Delhi – 110002
E-mail : ascgncd@gmail.com
Phone : +91 – 9868111799

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Naushad Ahmed Khan)



ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Ms. Manjula Das, Chairman

The applicant has filed this Original Application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeking the following reliefs:-

- “(i) *Quash and set aside order impugned order dated 21.05.2020.*
- (ii) *Direct Respondent no.1 to issue 'No Objection Certificate (NOC)' to Applicant for pursuing part-time PhD programme.*
- (iii) *Direct Respondent No.1 & 2 to allow Applicant to pursue the part-time Ph.D (Directorate in Philosophy),*
- (iv) *Pass such other orders as necessary in interest of justice.”*

2. The facts of the case are that the applicant was appointed as Assistant Professor in Maulana Azad Institute of Dental Science – respondent no.1 on 08.07.2008. He sought permission to pursue part-time PhD programme on 28.03.2020. However, respondent no.1 vide order dated 18.05.2020 rejected the said request on the ground of pending vigilance inquiry against him and conveyed the same to the applicant vide communication dated 21.05.2020.

3. We have considered the matter and perused the impugned order dated 18.05.2020, perusal of which reveals that the applicant was facing vigilance inquiry. In that view of the matter, we are convinced that refusal of the



applicant's request on the ground of pending disciplinary inquiry against him cannot be found fault with. No case is made out by the applicant to interfere with the impugned order. The OA, therefore, fails and is accordingly dismissed being devoid of merit.

4. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Manjula Das)
Chairman

/sd/vb/akshaya/