(3)

## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BOMBAY BENCH CIRCUIT SITTING AT NAGPUR

O.A. NO: 515/91

7

199

DATE OF DECISION. 9-3-1992

Ramkrishna Bhagwandas Upadhyay Petitioner

Mr.J.L.Bhoot

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus 🔪

The Director, Air Armament Inspection Wing,

D.T.D. & P(AIR), New Delhi and one another

Mr.Ramesh Darda

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A)

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see they Judgement?
- 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
- 3. Whethertheir Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
- 4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the <sup>√</sup> Tribunal ?

(U.C.SRIVASTAVA)

MD

mbm#



BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BOMBAY BENCH

## CAMP AT NAGPUR

## 0.A.515/91

, . . + B.5

Ramkrishna Bhagwandas Upadhyay, R/o.Empress Hostel, Room No.8,Ordnance Factory Chanda Estate Area,Chandrapur.

Applicant

VS.

- The Director,
   Air Armament Inspection Wing,
   D.T.D & P(AIR),
   H-Block, 18 Ministry of Defence,
   New Delhi.
- 2. Group Captain,
   Office Incharge
   Office of the Air Armament
   Inspection Wing,
   Ordnance Factory premises Khamaria,
   Jabalpur (M.R) ... Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Shri Justice U.C.Srivastava, Vice Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A)

## Appearances:

- 1. Mr.J.L.Bhoot
  Advocate for the applicant.
- 2. Mr.Ramesh Darda Counsel for the Respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT: Date: 9-3-1992 Per U.C.Srivastava, Vice-Chairman

As a very short question is involved and the pleadings are completed after hearing both the counsels—the application is disposed of at the admission stage itself. The application is admitted.

2. The applicant was working as Examiner in Air Armament Inspection Wing (Ordnance Factory)Chandrapur. He was initially appointed in 1962 as Armorar and was posted at Khamaria, Jabalpur. On 6th November, 1986 a memorandum under Rule 14 of CCS(CCA)Rules, 1965 was issued alleging that the applicant threatened one Shri Inderpal S.S.O. II of Dct.AAIW Chanda



that the applicant xxxixxxidaxx will kidnap his sons while gaing on the way to school or coming back. It was further alleged that the above act exhibited lack of devotion to duty and conduct unbecoming of a Government servant thereby violating Rule 3 of CCS(Conduct)Rules.1964.

- The applicant decimed the charges levelled against him. He was suspended on 14-8-1986. An Inquiry Officer as well as an Presenting Officer was appointed. In the meanwhile on 23-5-1987 the suspension order of the applicant was revoked.
- 4. The grievance of the applicant is that during the course of the enquiry the applicant was not allowed to cross examine the witnesses. He was also not supplied with relevant we copies of documents. As the applicant was not well versed with English language he requested the Inquiry Officer to issue him a Hindi version of the chargesheet. Despite his request the proceedings were conducted in English. Further, he was not given a copy of the Inquiry Officer's report before imposing the penalty by the Disciplinary authority in order to give wim an effective representation against the same.
- on one ground that non supply of Inquiry Officer's report to the delinquent employee before imposing the penalty has violated the principles of natural justice, as the delinquent employee could not make effective representation against the \*\*xmax\* proceedings or the punishment proposed. In this connection a reference be made to the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Union of India v. Mohd. Ramzan Khan (AIR 1991 SC 471) wherein it has been held that

submitted the report to the Disciplinary Authority holding the delinquent employee guilty of charges the Disciplinary Authority should give a copy of the Inquiry Officer's report to the delinquent in order to make effective representation and non supply of the same violates principles of natural justice. The same thing has happened in the instant case.

Accordingly the punishment order dtd. 7-9-1987 isquashed. However, this will not preclude the Disciplinary Authority going ahead with the inquiry proceedings after giving the applicant copy of the Inquiry Officer's report with reasonable time to make representation against the same. The application is disposed of on the above lines with no order as to costs.

(M.Y.PRIOLKAR) Member(A)

(U.C.SRIVASTAVA) Vice-hairman

MD

THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY BENCH

Review Petition No. 102/92

IN

X

O.A. No. 515/91

Ramkrishna Bhag andas Upadhyay ...........Applicant
Versus

Hon ble Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.

Hon ble Mr. M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A) Dt. 23-7-92.

(By Hon ble Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.)

The review application is directed against our judgment and ordered dated 9.3.92. The case was heard and disposed of after consel for the both the parties Scope of review application is limited. Review application can be entertained if there is any error apparent on the face of the record. In our opinion there is no error much less apparent error in our judgment. The empugned order. was passed on 17.9.87 and Ramjan Khan case was decided in 1990. Much before decision in Ramzan Khan case the plea of vidation of principles of natural justice im not giving report of enquiry officer had been taken in the case Even prior to it a full Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal in the P.I. Sharma case, (1988) A.T.C. Page 904) had already taken the someoview. In this vie the ples that reprospective effect to n main Than case which his neither amended the Administrative Tribunals act or curtibled the polars and jurisdiction of the Tribunal on abated the pending cases in which such a place has been taken, has been given is without substance. review application is eithout any merit and is cusmorily rejected.

/ Member (A)

Vice. Chairman

Dated: 232 July, 1992 (mdp)