

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH  
JAIPUR.

9

O.A.No.438/93

Dt. of order: 27.7.93

Bharosi Lal

: Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Ors.

: Respondents

Mr. Jas Raj

: Counsel for applicant.


CORAM


Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.L. Mehta, Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. P.P. Srivastava, Member (Adm.)

PER HON'BLE MR. P.P. SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER (ADM.).

Applicant Bharosi Lal, Chargeman, has come before us with the prayer that orders Annexure:A-1 & A-2, may be quashed and set aside and he should be given consequential benefits thereof. The main point raised by the learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant is not responsible for the shortage of stores but the Store Clerk is responsible for the same. He has also raised the point that the charge of negligence has not been levied in the charge sheet. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and perused the record. No process <sup>defects or</sup> ~~of~~ procedural defects have been pointed out by the learned counsel for the applicant. In Annexure:A-11, the appellate authority has recorded that the applicant was posted as Chargeman and put in-charge of Tool Room Store. He was assigned no other job. As such he cannot disclaim responsibility of what was happening in the Tool Room Store. During D.A.R. enquiry it has been proved that no undue pressure was put on him to extract admission of the charges. In view of this admission of guilty, we find no force in the O.A. and the same is rejected.

  
(P.P. Srivastava)  
Member (Adm.)

  
(D.L. Mehta)  
Vice Chairman.