

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
AHMEDABAD BENCH

**O.A. NO.** 371 OF 1992.

**Case No.**

**DATE OF DECISION** 8.12.1994.

Smt. Lilaben Jitendrakumar Bhatt, **Petitioner**

Mr. K.C. Bhatt, **Advocate for the Petitioner (s)**

**Versus**

Union of India & Ors. **Respondents**

Mr. Akil Kureshi, **Advocate for the Respondent (s)**

**CORAM**

**The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel, Vice Chairman.**

**The Hon'ble Mr. K. Ramamoorthy, Admn. Member.**

**JUDGMENT**

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

*No*

Smt. Lilaben Jitendrakumar Bhatt,  
Section Supervisor,  
C.T.O. Vadodara,  
Add: 34/10-C Maikrupa Society,  
Kareli Baug, Vadodara.

..... Applicant.

(Advocate: Mr. K.C. Bhatt)

Versus.

1. Union of India through  
The Director General  
Telecommunication Deptt,  
Dept. of Telecommunication,  
Ministry of Communication,  
Sanchar Bhavan,  
Parliament Street,  
New Delhi - 1.

2. Area Manager,  
Telecommunication, Styen Chamber,  
Vadodara Area,  
Raopura, Vadodara.

3. Senior Supdt. Telegraph Traffic,  
Vadodara Division,  
Nivrut Colony,  
Kareli Baug, Vadodara.

..... Respondents.

(Advocate: Mr. Akil Kureshi)

ORAL ORDER

O.A. No. 371 OF 1992

Date: 8.12.1994.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Pated, Vice Chairman.

We have heard Mr. K.C. Bhatt, the learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Akil Kureshi, the learned Additional Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. Mr. Bhatt has today produced a certified copy of the judgment dated 20.9.94 rendered by another Division Bench of the Tribunal at Ahmedabad in O.A. No. 409/91 to which judgment one of us (Hon'ble Mr. K. Ramamoorthy) was a party. There is no dispute about the fact that that

was a case in which another Postal employee Shri Mohmed Adam Bhabha faced an identical charge as the applicant of the present O.A for the same ~~incident~~<sup>fact</sup>. The ~~other~~ <sup>High</sup> Division Bench, in ~~the other~~ case has, by reasoned order, allowed that O.A and set aside the punishment of withholding of increment for one year which was awarded to the applicant Shri Mohmed Adam Bhabha of the said case. The same punishment is awarded to the present applicant and the present applicant has also challenged the punishment order on the same grounds.

3. We are in full agreement with the reasons on which ~~the~~ judgment in O.A. 409/91 is based and, therefore, for the same reasons, we allow the present O.A, quash and set aside the impugned punishment order dated 23.12.88 ~~has~~ also the Appellate order dated 12.3.90 and the Revisional order dated 11.7.92. We also make it clear that the same observations which are made in para-5 of the judgment in O.A. 409/91 to drop the matter, will apply to the case of the present applicant also. No order as to costs.

(K. Ramamoorthy)  
Member (A)

(N.B. Patel)  
Vice Chairman

vtc.