

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.3727/2018**

New Delhi, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**  
**Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Dr. Abhijit Bhawal  
S/o Sh. Amulya Ratan Bhawal  
R/o B-2 Staff Qtrs.  
National Zoological Park,  
New Delhi 110 003. ... Applicant.

(By Advocate : Shri Ranjan Kumar)

Vs.

1. Secretary, Forests  
Ministry of Environment and Forest,  
CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road,  
New Delhi 110 003.
2. The Director  
National Zoological Park,  
Mathura Road,  
New Delhi 110 003. .... Respondent.

(By Advocate : Shri Manjeet Singh Reen for Respondent No.1 and Shri Arun Kumar for respondent No.2.)

**: O R D E R (ORAL) :**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

The applicant is a Veterinary Doctor in the National Zoological Park, New Delhi. He was issued a letter dated 18.07.2018 requiring him to undergo training for a period of one month from 23.07.2018 at the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun. The applicant submitted a letter dated 19.07.2018 stating that his wife is ill, and it would be

difficult for him to undergo training. Thereafter, another order was issued on 14.08.2018. This time also, he did not proceed for training. For the 3<sup>rd</sup> time, an order was issued on 19.08.2018 requiring the applicant to undergo training. This OA is filed challenging the said order.

2. Heard Shri Ranjan Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Manjeet Singh Reen, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and Shri Arun Kumar, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

3. It is not in dispute that the applicant is working as a Veterinary Doctor in the National Zoological Park, New Delhi. Training in the Wildlife Institute is essential for effective discharge of duties in a Zoo. Further, the Institute to which the applicant is being sent for training is a specialized agency and the experience at that place would be of much use for treating the animals in the Zoo.

4. Obviously because the applicant pleaded the grounds of ill health of his wife, the respondents did not insist on his training in the month of July, 2018. When the order was passed in August, 2018, the applicant did not comply with the same. For the 3<sup>rd</sup> time, it is issued, and the applicant is virtually repeating the same grounds.

5. Even if, there exist any family problems, they cannot be kept above the discharge of duties. The respondents have already accommodated the applicant and he cannot expect anything more.

6. We do not find any merit in the OA. It is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Aradhana Johri)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/pj/