

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

* * *

Date of Decision: 15.9.2000

OA 676/93

Sanjay Purohit, IAS, r/o G-139, Shyam Nagar Extension,
Jaipur.

... Applicant

V/s

1. Union of India through Secretary (D.O.P.), Ministry of Personnel, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. State of Rajasthan through its Secretary, Department of Personnel, Secretariat, Jaipur.

... Respondents

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.S. RAIKOTE, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR.N.P.NAWANI, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

For the Applicant

... Mr.Mahendra Singh

For the Respondents

... Mr.U.D.Sharma

ORDER

PER HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.S. RAIKOTE, VICE CHAIRMAN

In this application filed u/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has prayed for a declaration that the orders dated 7.7.93 (Annexure A/3), dated 26.7.93 (Annexure A/4), dated 27.8.93 (Annexure A/5) and dated 18.10.93 (Annexure A/7) are illegal and null and void, with a further prayer for a direction to the respondents to allow the applicant to join Business Management Course

at Ahmedabad.

2. In support of the relief prayed for, the applicant
the detention
contended that on the basis of ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ of the applicant
w.e.f. 17.10.92, in pursuance of investigation relating to
a criminal charge, he was suspended vide Annexure A/1 dated
20.10.92. During the suspension period the applicant
thought of ~~joining~~ joining MBA Course at Ahmedabad and he
accordingly sought permission of the department. For that,
the department issued Annexure A/3 dated 7.7.93 stating
that the applicant was not supposed to join the MBA Course
without government's permission. The applicant was further
the
advised to mark attendance in the office every day during
the suspension period. Thereafter, the applicant sought
permission to leave the headquarters. That request was
also turned down vide order dated 26.7.93 (Annexure A/4).
Thereafter, the government issued another order dated
27.8.93 (Annexure A/5) informing the applicant that he
should report back to the State Government immediately,
failing which a D.E. will be initiated against him. It
is also stated that leaving headquarters without permission
and joining of MBA Course was against the provisions

contained in the relevant service rules. Against these endorsements the applicant made a detailed representation. For that, the government again issued reply dated 18.10.93 (Annexure A/7) stating that it was not possible for the government to permit the applicant to continue ~~x~~ studies/for MBA institute at in IIM/Ahmedabad. ~~xxxxxxfurtherxxxxxx~~ The applicant was again asked / to mark his attendance every day in the office of the Secretary to the Government, Department of Personnel, Rajasthan, Jaipur. The applicant has challenged these orders vide Annexures A/3, A/4, A/5 and A/7 raising several grounds.

3. By filing reply the respondents have stated that on the basis of the impugned orders vide Annexures A/3, A/4, A/5 and A/7 the departmental proceedings have already initiated against the applicant by framing charges. Alongwith the reply, the respondents have also filed a memorandum of charge-sheet dated 21.1.94 alongwith articles of charges and imputation of charges etc. On the basis of later this ~~later~~ development the respondents further contended that the present application has now become infructuous, in view of the fact that the impugned orders are the very

PM

orders which are the subject matter of the inquiry and the already ~~/xx~~ inquiry has been completed by submitting the inquiry report and it is at the stage of consulting with the UPSC for taking further action in the matter. The learned counsel for the respondents contended that if this Tribunal gives a finding one way or the other in respect of the impugned orders, which are the subject matter of the inquiry, the inquiry will be prejudiced. The respondents have also submitted that if any order is passed in this application that would ~~/xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ amount to preemption the order ~~xxxx~~ yet to be passed by the disciplinary authority in the inquiry. Even otherwise in the reply the respondents supported the impugned orders.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the parties. The learned counsel for the parties raised number of contentions with reference to the documents, record and other rules by relying upon certain judgements of the Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. We perused the impugned orders. We find that the impugned orders are the very orders which are for consideration in the inquiry initiated against the applicant.



on the basis of the memorandum of charge-sheet dated 21.1.94. The said charge-sheet has given the list of documents to be relied upon during the inquiry. From the said list we find that the ~~documents referred to in the article of charges~~ impugned orders are noted at Sl.No.2 (Annexure A/3), at Sl.No.3 (Annexure A/7), at Sl.No.4 (Annexure A/2), at Sl.No.5 (Annexure A/4), ~~and~~ at Sl.No.6 (Annexure A/5) and at Sl.No.10 (Annexure A/6).

fact
From this/ it is clear that the impugned orders are the very orders which are the subject matter in the said departmental inquiry. If we render judgement with reference to the impugned orders, definitely it will prejudice ~~the case~~ either the case of the applicant or the respondents in the inquiry. Normally when this ~~the~~ Tribunal finds that the very subject matter is seized by other competent authority, this Tribunal would allow that authority to proceed according to law, in view of the fact that such orders by such authority would be subject to the supervisory jurisdiction of this Tribunal ultimately. In fact similar in ~~the~~ circumstances, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has taken the view that such departmental inquiries should

not be normally interfered with unless such inquiry is by an authority who lacks an initial jurisdiction. In the instant case, it is not the case of the applicant that the authority who is now holding the departmental inquiry lacked any ~~initial~~ jurisdiction to initiate such proceedings. In these circumstances, we think it would not be proper in this case to give a finding with reference to the orders which are the subject matter of the inquiry before an authority. Almost in similar circumstances the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2000 SCC (L&S) 710 (Air India Ltd. v. M.Yogeshwar Raj) has laid down the law that the High Court ~~should~~ should not entertain ^a ~~the~~ petition involving certain facts yet to be finally decided by the disciplinary authority. We think it appropriate to ~~extract~~ extract the relevant part of the judgement as under :-

"8. It appears from a copy of the writ petition that the respondent has not questioned the jurisdiction of the disciplinary authority to issue the impugned show-cause notice. The two issues of the respondent's caste and whether he had adequately explained the production of the bogus certificate of 4-2-1998 are yet to be decided by the disciplinary authority. Both the issues are primarily issues of fact. The High Court should not have pre-empted a factual decision of the disciplinary authority on the issues. Nor should the High Court have stayed the proceedings on a prima facie finding on the subject-matter of

inquiry particularly when the competence of the disciplinary authority was not in doubt."

In the instant ~~x~~ case, the disciplinary authority has yet to decide regarding the validity of the same impugned orders which are ~~not~~ challenged before us in the present

application. It is no doubt ^{true} ~~proved~~ that the present

application was filed earlier to the initiation of the

departmental inquiry/~~substantive fact xxxxxxxx that xxxxxx~~

[illegible]

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ giving a finding one

way or the other on the basis of the impugned orders

would definitely frustrate the departmental proceedings.

Even ~~if~~ otherwise the findings if recorded with reference

to these impugned orders would definitely prejudice either

the applicant or the respondents. We think it appropriate

t o leave the consideration of the validity of the impugned

orders for the disciplinary authority and after passing the

order ~~of the~~ by the disciplinary authority it is always

party aggrieved
open to the/xxxxxxx to approach this Tribunal xxxxxxxxxx

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

6. For the above reasons, we think it appropriate to

pass the order as under :-

PN

The application is dismissed keeping ~~in view~~ the contentions of the respective parties open, to be considered by the disciplinary authority in the inquiry initiated against the applicant vide memorandum of charge-sheet dated 21.1.94. No costs.



(N.P. NAWANI)
MEMBER (A)



(B.S. RAIKOTE)
VICE CHAIRMAN