

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.2522/2019**

New Delhi, this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019

**Hon'ble Justice Mr. L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Shri K.L. Meena  
S/o Late Shri C.L. Meena  
Deputy Director, AIR Safety  
Office of Director, AIR Safety  
Office of Deputy Director General  
(Northern Region)  
New Delhi.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri R.K. Poswal)

Vs.

1. Union of India through its Secretary  
Ministry of Civil Aviation  
Directorate General of Civil Aviation  
New Delhi.

2. The Director General  
Directorate General of Civil Aviation  
New Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Rajeev Kumar)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:-**

The applicant is working as Deputy Director, AIR Safety in the office of Directorate General of Civil Aviation, Northern Region, the second respondent herein. He was issued a charge memo dated

26.04.2019, wherein it was alleged that the son of the applicant has undergone training in an institution which was directly under his control. This OA is filed challenging the charge memo dated 26.04.2019. The applicant contends that whenever his son was undergoing training in the field of aviation, he submitted letters, from time to time, intimating the absence of any interest in the concerned training centers. It is stated that the charge contained in the memorandum is without any basis.

2. We heard Shri R.K. Poswal, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajeev Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. The allegation made against the applicant in the charge memo is that his son has undergone training in MP Flying Club, Bhopal at a time when the applicant was working as Deputy Director, AIR Safety in the Western Region, which had jurisdiction over the said club. The question as to whether the charge is true or not, needs to be examined in the inquiry, which may be held depending upon the explanation of the applicant. The various letters relied upon by the applicant, such

as those dated 11.07.2014, 04.08.2014 and 03.11.2014, can be relied upon, in the course of inquiry. We do not find any jurisdictional or patent error in the institution of disciplinary proceedings.

4. The OA is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member(A)**

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

/vb/