

23

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

REVIEW PETITION NO.36/99
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.919/95.

DATED : 30.9.1999.

Coram : Hon'ble Shri Justice R.G.Vaidyanatha, Vice-Chairman,
Hon'ble Shri B.N.Bahadur, Member(A).

E.Jebamani,
C/o. Mrs.Neeta V.Masurkar,
D-35, Sub-sector-II, Sector - 4,
Airoli,
New Bombay - 400 708.

...Applicant.

Vs.

1. Union of India through
the Secretary,
Department of Atomic Energy,
C.S.M.Marg, Anushakti Bhavan,
Bombay - 400 039.
2. The Additional Secretary,
Department of Atomic Energy,
Government of India,
Government of India,
C.S.M.Marg,
Bombay.
3. Director,
Government of India,
Department of Atomic Energy,
Directorate of Estates Management,
V.S.Bhavan, Anushaktinagar,
Bombay -400 094.
4. State of Tamilnadu,
through Superintendent of Police,
District-Police Office,
Ooty - Nilgiris,
Tamilnadu State - 643 001.

...Respondents.

: ORDER ON REVIEW PETITION BY CIRCULATION :

This is a petition for reviewing our order dt. 13.8.1999
in OA 919/95. We have perused the contents of the Review
Petition and the entire case records.

...2.

(Signature)

2. The applicant's services came to be terminated by the respondents on the ground that he had suppressed material information. The applicant had challenged the termination on the ground that no enquiry was held and therefore, the order is bad in law.

3. After hearing both the sides, we found that this is a case of termination on the basis of the conditions and warnings given in the Attestation Form which provided furnishing false information or suppression of material information is a ground for termination at any stage. We also noticed that the department has observed the principles of natural justice by issuing a show cause notice to the applicant and then after receiving reply from the applicant the impugned order was passed. We have also rejected the contention of the applicant that a regular enquiry was necessary in a matter like this.

4. The applicant still persists in the RP in contending that a regular enquiry should have been held, which we ^{have} ~~had~~ specifically rejected in our order. This is not a case of obtaining appointment on a false certificate so that an enquiry is necessary under O.M. dt. 19.5.1993 or on the basis of a Judgment of another D.B. of this Tribunal dt. 28.7.1999 where the question was about obtaining appointment on a false certificate. But, in the present case the question was about suppression of material fact in a particular column in the attestation form.

5. After going through the materials on record, we do not find that any case is made out to show that there is any error apparent on record. No grounds are made out within the meaning of Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC for exercising review jurisdiction.

Hence, we do not find any merit in the Review Petition.

6. For the above reasons, the Review Petition is rejected by this order on circulation.

B.N.Bahadur

(B.N. BAHADUR)

MEMBER (A)

R.G.Vaidyanatha

(R.G. VAIDYANATHA)

VICE-CHAIRMAN

B.