

51263
21-11-90

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH

.....

Registration NO. T.A. 533 of 1987
(C.A. NO. 23 of 1981)

Union of India ... Defendant-Appellant

versus

R.C. Chaturvedi ... Plaintiff-Respondent

Hon' Mr D.K. Agrawal, J.M.

Hon' Mr K. Chayya, A.M.

(By Hon' Mr D.K. Agrawal, J.M.)

Civil Appeal No. 23/81 preferred in the
Court of District Judge, Mathura against the
order and judgment dated 29-11-80 passed in
Original Suit No. 223 of 1978, has been received
on transfer under section 29 of the Administrative
Tribunals' Act, 1985 and registered as T.A. No.
533 of 1987 as indicated above.

2. The plaintiff-respondent who was employed
in All India Radio as Engineering Assistant was
working at Mathura in 1975. On 1-5-1975 he was
to draw an increment on crossing the Efficiency Bar.
But, he was not allowed to cross the Efficiency
Bar and his representations to the authorities
in this regard proved to be of no avail. Aggrieved,
he filed a suit in the Court of learned Munsif



✓
Sri R.C. Chaturvedi s/o Shyam Lal Chaturvedi
R/o Gadesh-nan Tola, Mathura

6

Mathura. The suit was decreed in his favour and it was also ordered that an amount of Rs.199.50 be paid to the plaintiff-respondent towards the arrear of increments.

3. The defendant-appellant preferred this appeal against the orders of the learned Munsif on the ground that the plaintiff-respondent was not allowed to cross Efficiency Bar for valid reasons. His Confidential Reports for the year, 1974 - 75 were found to be un-satisfactory and that there was also a criminal case against the plaintiff-respondent under sections 323 and 353 of I.P.C. for assault ^{on} a public servant in the Office resulting in causing head injuries to the Station Engineer, All India Radio, Mathura. The criminal case, however, ended in discharge of the plaintiff-respondent for want of adequate evidence. It is contended by the defendant-appellant there were good and sufficient reasons for with-holding Efficiency Bar. It would appear that subsequently the services of the plaintiff-respondent were terminated w.o.f. 20-8-1976. We have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the record. The Annual Confidential Reports of the Plaintiff-Respondent for the years 1974-75 are very unsatisfactory, and these



adverse entries were also communicated to the plaintiff-respondent. It is also noticed that he was issued several memos regarding un-satisfactory work and he was also warned to be careful and discharge his duties with the sense of responsibility. Taking the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that the learned Munsif erred in arriving at the decision that the plaintiff-respondent was entitled for crossing the Efficiency Bar and decreed that an amount of Rs.199-50 may be paid to him. We are of the view that the appeal has merit and that the crossing of Efficiency Bar on 1-7-75 was with-held for good and sufficient reasons. The appeal is allowed and the order and decree passed by the learned Munsif in O.S. No. 223 of 1978 is set aside. Parties to bear their costs.



TRUE
COPY

sh
MEMBER (A)

sh
MEMBER (J)

(sns)

September 18, 1990.

(SHARAD KUM/Allahabad.
SECTION OFFICER
Central Administrative Tribunal
Allahabad.

prel. on
5/10/90
SD