

4

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

A H M E D A B A D B E N C H

O.A. No. 342 1987 1987

DATE OF DECISION 26/4/1990

Shri Babubhai Amritlal Parmar **Petitioner**

Mr. A. B. Patel Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

## Versus

Union of India Respondent

Mr. J. D. Ajmera Advocate for the Respondent(s)

**CORAM.**

The Hon'ble Mr. N. Dharmadan . . . . . Judicial Member

The Hon'ble Mr. M. M. Singh .. Administrative Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

Shri Babubhai Amritlal Parmar  
House No. 1398,  
'Pavagadh Chowk',  
Shri Fusabhai Marg, Raikhad,  
AHMEDABAD. Vs.

..Applicant

Union of India  
Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau,  
(Ministry of Home Affairs),  
Government of India,  
Bunglow No. 31,  
Shahibaug,  
Ahmedabad - 380 004.

..Respondents.

Coram : Hon'ble Mr.N.Dharmadan : Judicial Member  
Hon'ble Mr.M.M.Singh : Administrative  
Member

ORAL ORDER

Date : 26/4/1990

Per : Hon'ble Mr.N.Dharmadan : Judicial Member

The applicant is challenging the order of termination dated 11.9.1986 issued by respondents under Rule 5 of the C.C.S. Temporary Service (Rules) 1965, the applicant was taken in the service by order No. A-12/85 dated 7.1.1985 and he was allowed to continue till 11.9.1986. The complaint of the applicant is that the termination order is illegal and not in terms of the order of appointment. It does not mention any reason.

The respondents filed a counter affidavit in which it has been stated that the appointment of the applicant was on a temporary basis and his services can be terminated simpliciter because he was not found suitable to be retained in the Government service as his performance was not satisfactory.

Neither the applicant nor his counsel was present at the time when the case was called. We have heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the respondents and perused the records carefully. Having heard the learned counsel for the respondents and after perusing the documents we are satisfied that this is a case of termination simplicitor there is no illegality in the termination. Accordingly, we are left with only the alternative of dismissing the application as devoid of any substance. We do so. There will be no order as to costs.

M. M. Singh

( M.M. Singh )  
Administrative Member

N. Dharmadan

( N.Dharmadan )  
Judicial Member

AIT