

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH, JABALPUR

Original Application No: 698/2000

Jabalpur, this the 13th February, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI M.P.SINGH, MICE CHAIRMAN

Jagdish Jhumukhla Warkhade  
I.O.F.S., aged about 38 years  
s/o Shri Jhumukhla Warkhade,  
Working as Works Manager,  
Ordnance Factory, Katni  
R/o 11, Westland Ordnance Factory,  
Estate, Katni (MP) 483 503.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.Nagu)

-versus-

1. Union of India through  
Secretary,  
Defence Production,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi.
2. Chairman,  
Ordnance Factory Board,  
10-A, S.K.Bose Road,  
Calcutta (W.B.).
3. General Manager,  
Ordnance Factory Katni  
Distt. Katni (MP).483 503.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri B.da.Silva)

ORDER (ORAL)

By M.P.Singh, Vice Chairman -

By filing this O.A. the applicant has sought a direction to quash the letter dated 19.07.1999(A/2) whereby certain adverse remarks have been communicated to the applicant in his annual confidential report for the period from 1.4.1998 to 31.3.1999 and order dt.3.12.99, whereby his representation has been rejected. M

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant is working as Joint General Manager in Grey Iron Foundry at Jabalpur. He has been communicated certain adverse remarks recorded by the reporting officer for the period from 1.4.1998 to 31.3.1999, As a result of

*[Signature]*

which, the applicant preferred representation to the respondents stating that adverse remarks recorded in his A.C.R. for the period from 1.4.1998 to 31.3.1999 have been communicated without giving him an opportunity <sup>2</sup> or without bringing the shortcomings to his notice before recording the adverse remarks. He was never counselled either orally or in writing before recording these adverse remarks. According to him, <sup>The instruction contained in the</sup> letter dated 31.1.2000 (Annexure A-6) issued by the Director General of Ordnance Factory addressed to the General Manager, have not been complied by the reporting officer while recording his ACR. Therefore, adverse remarks contained in the ACR are required to be expunged by the respondents. The respondents vide their letter dated 3.12.1999 considered the representation of the applicant submitted by him and rejected the same. Aggrieved by this, the applicant has filed this O.A.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents on the other hand states that the applicant has been given oral counselling repeatedly by the reporting officer before recording the adverse remarks. Moreover, the letter dated 31.1.2000 issued by the Director General of Ordnance Factories to the General Manager relates to the subsequent period of recording the adverse remarks. Further this letter is an internal correspondence, which is addressed only to the General Manager, Ordnance Factory.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. I have carefully considered the rival contentions of the parties and I find that certain adverse remarks in the confidential report of the applicant for the period 1998-99 have been recorded in his confidential report. As per instructions given from time to time, the reporting officer is required to give counselling to bring to the notice of an employee about the shortcomings observed by him during the period of reporting. The

*M.J.H.*

shortcomings observed by the reporting officer should be communicated to the employee in writing. In case, the employee does not show any improvement and does not make any effort to overcome the shortcomings, the same should be recorded in his confidential report.

6. In this case, I find that there is no documentary evidence to show that the applicant was given counselling by the reporting officer to bring the shortcomings to his notice. Therefore, the procedure laid down by the Government has not been followed by the reporting officer and the applicant has not been given any opportunity. Hence, the principles of natural justice have been violated by the respondents.

7. Learned counsel for the applicant has cited the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in the case of State of U.P. Vs. Yamuna Shanker Mishra, reported in (1997) 4 SCC 7, the relevant portion of which is extracted below:-

"7.....Before forming an opinion to be adverse, the reporting officers writing confidentials should share the information which is not a part of the record with the officer concerned, have the information confronted by the officer and then make it part of the record. This amounts to an opportunity given to the erring/corrupt officer to correct the errors of the judgement, conduct, behaviour, integrity or conduct/corrupt proclivity...."

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we quash and set aside the order dated 3.12.1999 (Annexure A/7). The applicant is directed to make a fresh detailed representation to the respondents with regard to adverse remarks/ entered in his ACRs for the year 1998-99, and if he complies with the said direction, the respondents are directed to consider his representation, in view of the above observations, and also in the light of instructions issued by the Government in this regard from time to time, and to take a decision within a period of three months from the

*[Signature]*

date of receipt of such representation by passing a speaking, detailed and reasoned order.

9. With the above directions, the O.A. is disposed of.  
No costs.

  
(M.P.Singh)  
Vice Member

/skm/

पूर्णकाल रोड/रोड नं. .... निम्नलिखित  
सूचना पर्याप्त नहीं है।  
(1) इसका नाम और संख्या क्या है? *S. Nagpal.*  
(2) इसका विवरण और विवरण का नाम तात्परता  
(3) इसका विवरण और विवरण का नाम तात्परता  
(4) इसका विवरण और विवरण का नाम तात्परता  
सूचना एवं उपरोक्त सवालों का उत्तर  
*B. Chaitanya*  
*B. Chaitanya*  
उप रजिस्ट्रार 3/04

Issued  
M. 3.04  
(0.3.04)