

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA No. 4434/2014

New Delhi, this the 8th day of August, 2019

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

Bal Kishan, S/o Sh Ratan Lal,
Aged about 49 years,
Resident of Mohalla – Dabariya,
Town- Pilkhuwa,
Dist – Hapur, UP
Pin – 245304,
Sr. Accountant. .. Applicant

(None for the applicant)

Versus

Union of India & Others through:

1. The Secretary,
M/o Civil Aviation,
Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan,
Safdarjung Airport,
New Delhi – 110003.
2. The Additional Controller General of Accounts,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Expenditure,
Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market,
New Delhi – 110003.
3. The Joint Controller General of Accounts,
O/o the Controller General of Accounts,

Ministry of Finance,
Department of Expenditure,
Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market,
New Delhi – 110003.

4. The Financial Controller,
M/o Civil Aviation & Tourism,
B- Wing, Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan,
Safdarjung Airport,
New Delhi – 110003.
5. The Inquiry Officer,
Principal Accounts Office,
M/o Civil Aviation & Tourism,
Double Storey Building near Dispensary,
Indian Airlines Complex,
Safdarjung Airport,
New Delhi – 110003. .. Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Rohit Sehrawat for
Shri Rajeev Kumar)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

The applicant was working as Senior Accountant in the Ministry of Civil Aviation. He was issued a Charge Memorandum dated 18.08.2006, alleging that he remained absent from 21.09.2005 onwards, and that has shown lack of devotion to duty. The applicant did not

respond to the Charge Memorandum nor did he participate in the disciplinary proceedings. It was held ex-parte and through an order dated 06.05.2009, the disciplinary authority imposed the punishment of "removal from service". An appeal preferred by the applicant herein, was rejected, through an order dated 03.07.2014. This O.A. is filed challenging the order of punishment, as upheld by the Appellate Authority.

2. The O.A. was listed for hearing on 30.07.2019. On noticing that there is no representation for the applicant and since it is one of the oldest cases, we directed that if the applicant does not turn up on the next date of hearing, it would be dismissed for default or would be decided under Rule 15 of C.A.T. (Procedure) Rules, 1987. The applicant did not turn up on the subsequent dates of hearing.

3. We perused the records and find that the applicant did not participate in the disciplinary proceedings. Absence for years together in any department cannot be tolerated and the very purpose of employing the person

would be defeated. The applicant hardly has any explanation to offer, as to why he remained absent and why he did not participate in the disciplinary proceedings.

4. We do not find any merit in the O.A. Accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

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

/jyoti/