

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE  
TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH,  
BANGALORE**

- 9 -

ORDER SHEET (Contd)

Application No. 130 of 1986 (T)

Applicant

Respondent

Advocate for Applicant

Advocate for Respondent

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
5.9.86.	<p>Sri. Ramesh Rao for Applicant absent. Sri. M.V. Rao for Respondent present. Application is adjourned to 8/9/86 at request.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B.D. <u>                    </u> COCH-2</p>	
6-9-86	<p>Counsel for both sides present. (For applicant - V.V. Venkateshwar - Krishnaiah) The case is adjourned to 18-9-86.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B.D. <u>                    </u> 8/9/86 Couch-2</p>	
18.9.1986	<p>None present for the applicant. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao present for the respondents. Shri Rao requests for one week's time to file a supplemental statement of objections in the matter. Request granted. This application will be listed for hearing on 30.9.1986. Notice shall be issued to both sides by registered post/AO intimating the next date of hearing. They shall also be informed that no further adjournment</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A the applicant and his counsel</p>	

.../-

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
19.9.86	Notice issued to Advocates for both the <del>parties</del> applicant and to the applicant.	<p><i>shall</i> will be granted in the matter and in their absence, the matter will be decided <u>ex parte</u>.</p> <p><i>18.9.86</i></p> <p>(L.H.A. Rego) (Ch. Ramakrishna Rao) Member (AM) Member (JM) 18.9.1986 18.9.1986</p>
30/9/86	Both Side Counsel present Case filed Reply. Arguments Concluded. Orders Reserved.	
10.10.1986.	<p>BO 33. COEH-2.</p> <p>The Hon'ble Sh. Ch. Ramakrishna Rao (MF) The Hon'ble Sh. L.H.A. Rego (MA) Sri. D. Deekrishnan for Applr. present. Sri. Mr. Rao for R. present. Judgment pronounced. Applo. is dismissed. BO. 33 COEH-2</p>	<p>The grievance of the applicant is that the charges levelled against him, viz., short payment of the amounts received by him, have not been substantiated and in view thereof, the 2nd respondent was not justified in imposing any penalty on the applicant. In the statement of objections filed on behalf of the respondents, it is stated that the charges were esta- blished by adducing oral as well a documentary evidence.</p> <p>On perusing the record and hea- ring the counsel on both sides, we are satisfied that the grievance of the applicant is more imaginary than real, nor is the applicant justified in pleading that the penalty imposed on him is excessiv- We therefore see no reason to set aside the impugned order. The application is dismissed. No costs.</p> <p><i>CH. R.K. RAO</i> <i>(L.H.A. REGO)</i> (CH. R.K. RAO) (L.H.A. REGO) MEMBER (JM) MEMBER (AM) 27.X.1986 27.X.1986 dms.</p>