

3  
5  
IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH : CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO : 100 OF 1991

Date of decision : October 4, 1993

Narayan Prasad Das

...

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

...

Respondents

( For Instructions )

1. Whether it be referred to the reporters or not? NO
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Admin. Tribunals or not? NO

1.5 ipsa. lnt  
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)  
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

04 OCT 93

*Recd 4/10/93*  
(K.P. ACHAR YA)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

(6)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH : CUTTACK

Original Application No.100 of 1991

Date of decision: October 4, 1993

Narayana Prasad Das	...	Applicant
Versus		
Union of India & Others	...	Respondents
For the Applicant	... Ms. Devanand Misra, Deepak Misra, R.N.Naik, A.Deo, B.S.Tripathy, P.Panda, Advocates	
For the Respondents	... Mr. Ashok Misra, Senior Standing Counsel (Central)	

-----  
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. K.P. ACHARYA, VICE CHAIRMAN  
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.)

---

JUDGMENT

K.P.ACHARYA, V.C. In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the petitioner prays for a direction to the Director General of All India Radio, Opposite Party No.2, to dispose of the representation of the petitioner contained in Annexure-1.

2. Shorn of unnecessarily detail, it would suffice to state that the petitioner was proceeded against in

7)

a disciplinary enquiry on an allegation that he had claimed false medical reimbursement. It was told to us that the enquiry officer and the disciplinary authority found that the charge had not been established. But Opposite Party No.2 while reviewing the matter, came to the conclusion that the charge had been established and imposed a penalty of reduction of pay. This Bench heard the matter which formed <sup>objection matter of</sup> Original Application No.66 of 1988 disposed of on March 16, 1988. We disposed of the case as barred by limitation and express<sup>ed</sup> no opinion on the merits of the case. A Review Application has been filed before the Opposite Party No.2 praying to review its order, imposing penalty on the petitioner. The representation has not since been disposed of. Prayer is for a direction to dispose of the said representation. In case the representation, filed by the petitioner, has not yet been disposed of, Opposite Party No.2 is directed to dispose of the representation of the petitioner within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment.

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

4. This order is passed after hearing Mr.R.N.Naik learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.Ashok Misra learned Senior Standing Counsel (Central).

..... MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE) 04 OCT 93

Central Admn. Tribunal,  
Cuttack Bench, K. Mohanty  
4th October, 1993.

