

11

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
HYDERABAD

R.A.No.120 of 1999 in OA.No.33 of 1999

DATE OF ORDER:1-2-2000.

Between:

P.Sasi Sekhar.

...Applicant

a n d

1. Union of India, rep. by its
Controller and Auditor General of
India, New Delhi.
2. Principal Chief Controller of
Accounts, Central Board of Excise
and Customs, A.G.C.R.Building,
1st Floor, New Delhi-2.
3. Pay and Accounts Officer,
Commissionerate of Customs and
Central Excise, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.

...Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT :: Mr.K.K.Chakravathy

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS :: Mr.V.Rajeshwar Rao

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.H.NASIR, VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

: O R D E R :

(PER HON'BLE SRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (A))

Heard Mr.K.K.Chakravathy, learned Counsel for the
Applicant and Mr.V.Rajeshwar Rao, learned Standing
Counsel for the Respondents.

.....2

2

12


2. The applicant in the OA has filed this RA for reviewing the Order in the OA dated 10-11-1999. A careful perusal of the RA affidavit indicates only the observations made by the Tribunal and nowhere it has been found some error in the Judgment. It only states that the services of the applicant has been terminated without following the rules and also a compassionate ground appointee cannot be thrown out without holding a proper enquiry. It also states that the applicant is a poor/^{employee}and termination of his services will cause irreparable damage to him.

3. These are not the points for consideration in this RA. What is required is to pin pointedly state the error, if any, in the Judgment. We have gone through the Judgment. The Judgment clearly indicates that the services of the applicant were terminated under Sub-Rule (1) of Rule(5) of the CCS(Temporary Servants) Rules,1965, without attaching any stigma in his termination order. It also states that the Principles of Natural Justice has been followed. Para.9 summarizes the reason for his termination even though he is a compassionate ground appointee. That termination was ~~due~~ to his own making.

4. In view of what is stated above, we find no ^{error} ~~error~~ in the RA, and the RA is dismissed. No costs.



(R.RANGARAJAN)
MEMBER (ADMN.)



(D.H.NASIR)
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: this the 1st day of February, 2000

Dictated in the Open Court