

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH
(CAMP: NAGPUR)

Original Application No: 737/92

Transfer Application No:

DATE OF DECISION: 13.12.1994

K.C. Juneja

Petitioner

Mr. M. Sudame

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

U.O.I. & Ors.

Respondent

Mr. R. Darda

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande V.C.

The Hon'ble Shri M.R. Kolhatkar, M(A)

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *NO*
2. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? *NO*

[Signature]
V.C.

3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH
CIRCUIT SITTING AT NAGPUR

O.A. NO. 737/92

Kishorlal Chimanlal Juneja ..Applicant

V/s.

Union of India & Ors. ..Respondents

Coram: Hon. Shri Justice M.S. Deshpande, V.C.
Hon. Shri M.R. Kolhatkar, Member (A).

Appearance:

Mr. M. Sudame
counsel for the applicant

Mr. R. Darda
counsel for the respondents

ORAL JUDGMENT: DATED: 13.12.1994
(Per: M.S. Deshpande, Vice Chairman)

Heard the counsel.

2. By the present application the applicant challenges the order of termination passed against him as a sequel to his conviction to a criminal charge by a Criminal Court and resulted in a fine of Rs.50/- for an offence under the Bombay ^{Prevention} Prohibition of Gambling Act. When the applicant approached the Tribunal on the earlier occasion by O.A. No. 773/89 Kishorlal Chimanlal Juneja Vs. Director General, Ordnance Service, the Tribunal had directed the respondents to reinstate the applicant, leaving it open to the respondents to hold an inquiry in accordance with law in case the respondents desire to terminate the services.

3. No reply had been filed by the respondents. Mr. Sudame, Ld. counsel for the applicants states that no show cause notice was given to the applicant after the criminal trial ended in his conviction as to why his services should not be terminated.

4. Shri Darda, Id. counsel for the respondents pointed out that a show cause notice was given to the applicant and the termination was as a sequel to the show cause notice.

5. Since the rules are substantially complied, we see no merit in the present application and is dismissed.

M.R. Kolhatkar

(M.R. Kolhatkar)
Member(A)

M.S. Deshpande
(M.S. Deshpande)
Vice Chairman