

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

**O.A. No.60/648/2018**

**Date of decision: 10.10.2018**

**M.A. No.60/1014/2018**

...

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).  
HON'BLE MRS. P. GOPINATH, MEMBER (A).**

...

Harcharan Singh, aged about 53 years, S/o Sh. Harmohinder Singh, R/o House No.3026, Sector 27D, Chandigarh (Group A).

**... APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through its Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Financial Services, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
2. Under Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Financial Services, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.

**... RESPONDENTS**

**PRESENT:** Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv., along with Mr. Kanan Malik, counsel for the applicant.  
Mr. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents.

**ORDER (Oral)**

...

**SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-**

1. In this O.A., the applicant has sought the following relief:-

"8(i). Quashing of letter/order dated 15.05.2018 (Annexure A-10) vide which in a completely illegal manner and in gross violation of principles of natural justice, respondent no.2 has directed the applicant to file a reply/written statement to the Memorandum of Charge dated 28.03.2018 (A-3), without supplying the copies of documents that form part of the aforesaid memorandum of Charges as the respondents have relied on the said documents to frame charges against the applicant.

(ii). Directions be issued to the respondents to supply copies of the documents which have been mentioned in Annexure-III of the memorandum of charges dated 28.03.2018 so as to enable the applicant to file a requisite reply to the charges alleged against the applicant and further grant the applicant requisite time to file his

written statement after supplying the documents mentioned in the Annexure-III, of the memorandum of charges.”

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the applicant stated that this O.A. has been rendered infructuous, as the documents asked for by the applicant have been supplied to by the respondents to the applicant. However, he submits that since similar charge sheet has been quashed by the Principal Bench of the Tribunal in case of identically placed employee, therefore, he may be allowed liberty to challenge the charge sheet by way of separate proceedings. Apparently, that is not the scope of the instant O.A.
3. In view of the statement of learned counsel for the applicant, this O.A. is dismissed as infructuous, in its present form. M.A. also stands disposed of accordingly. No costs.

**(P. GOPINATH)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

Date: 10.10.2018.  
Place: Chandigarh.

`KR’