

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 462 of 1991

Date of Decision: September 23, 1993

M. Bairagi

Applicant(s)

Versus

Union of India and others

Respondent(s)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? *no*
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches
of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ? *no*


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

23 SEP 93

 23/9/93
(K. P. ACHARYA)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

6

5



ACH

ACH

ag

petitioner entered into the conference hall and grossly misbehaved with the General Manager Shri M.K.Saha. A full fledged enquiry was conducted and the petitioner has been punished as stated above and the appeal preferred by him to the appellate authority not having yielded^{ed} any fruitful result, This^{kn} application has been filed with the aforesaid prayer.

3. In their counter, the opposite parties maintain that there is overwhelming evidence on the side of the prosecution to bring home the charge against the delinquent officer and principles of natural justice having been strictly followed, the case being devoid of merit is liable to be dismissed.

4. We have heard Mr. C.M.K. Murty learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Ashok Misra learned Senior Standing Counsel (Central). We do not like to express any opinion on the culpability of the petitioner because of the order we propose to pass in this case. The initial objection raised by the petitioner's counsel is that the order of punishment is liable to be quashed because the General Manager who is the disciplinary authority is the victim in this case and has necessarily deposed in the disciplinary proceeding and the settled position of law being that a man cannot be the judge of his own cause, the punishment is liable to be quashed. In the case of UNION OF INDIA V. TULSIRAM PATEL REPORTED IN AIR 1985 S.C. 1416, Their Lordships have observed that

a man cannot be the judge of his own case and the principle 'AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM' should be followed in a strictest term. Of course this point was argued on behalf of the same petitioner in Original Application No. 282 of 1990 which was disposed of on 31st January, 1992. We had kept this question open and today we are of opinion that there has been a gross violation of principles of natural justice because a man cannot be the judge of his own cause. Therefore, we would hereby quash the order of punishment imposed on the petitioner and remand the case with a direction that the competent authority may appoint a disciplinary authority for the purpose of this case alone and charges, if any, should be framed against the petitioner by such disciplinary authority and thereafter the matter should proceed and be disposed of according to law within 120 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. We express no opinion on the other contention of Mr. Murty because it may create some embarrassment to all concerned.

5. Thus, the application is accordingly disposed of leaving the parties to bear their own costs.


MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)
23 SEP 93

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Cuttack Bench, Cuttack/K. Mohanty/
23rd September, 1993.


23.9.93
VICE-CHAIRMAN

