

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/01403/2018

DATED THIS THE 26th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2019

HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Sri K.V.Nancharaiiah
#103, Bhage Gowda Layout
"SAI Lotus" Channasandra
Rajarajeshwarinagar
Bangalore-560 098.

....Applicant

(By Advocate Sri N.Amaresh)

Vs.

1. The Director General of
Sports Authority of India
J.N.Stadium Complex
(East Gate) Lodhi Road
New Delhi-110 003.
2. The Regional Director
Sports Authority of India
South Centre
Mysore Road
Bangalore-560 056.
3. The Regional Director/Principal
Sports Authority of India
(Lakshmi Bhai National College
of Physicial Education)
P.O.Box # 03, Kariyabattam
Thiruvananthapuram-695 581.
4. Kum.Padmaja Bala
Flat No.S-3, Sri Chandra Apts.
Opp. to Nice Bar
Mogalrajapuram-8
Andra Pradesh.

....Respondents

(By Advocates Sri M.Vasudeva Rao & Sri Ranganatha S.Jois for R4)

ORDER

(PER HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, MEMBER (ADMN))

The case of the applicant is that he was appointed as Field Asst/Jr.Accountant on 21.6.1991 at Sports Training Center(STC), Eluru, West Godavari District, Sports Authority of India (SAI). He was promoted as Sr.Accountant and transferred to SAI,Bangalore on 10.5.2010. In the year 2010, it was reported that there are certain altercations/conflict/quarrel between inmates of the STC, SAI, Medak and local PETs. It was also reported that there is mismanagement at the STC and the inmates/trainees also indulged in consumption of alcohol, drugs etc., and in that connection on 6.10.2010, a three men committee was constituted to enquire into the same. The applicant was one of the members and other two are one Mr.Jagmohan(Kabaddi Kocko)(KKK) and Adinarayana (BB). The applicant submits that one Kum.Padmaja Bala who was appointed as a Kabaddi Kocko(KKK) Coach by the State of AP on 27.7.1987 was initially posted at District Sports Authority(DSA) and in the year she was transferred to Warangal District HQ and eventually transferred to STC, SAI Medak in the year 2005 where she worked up to February 2013. When the committee visited the STC, Medak, incidentally P.Padmaja Bala was also questioned about the incidents of altercations between the inmates of the Center and Local PETs at the same time incidentally it came to light that Kum.Padmaja Bala was continuously absent for months together at STC, Medak and she was not even staying at Medak. Being disturbed by these revelations, Kum.Padmaja Bala alleged that the applicant during the inquiry used un-parliamentary language to her and had submitted a cooked-up compliant adding certain trivial matters on 6.11.2010 to the Regional Director, SAI, Bangalore mainly alleging that applicant being a lower rank official would not have been appointed as a member of the committee to question

her(Annexure-A1). Since the said complaint did not receive good response, she submitted another complaint(Annexure-A2) consisting almost the same allegations with an additional paragraph falsely alleging that during 1990s, the applicant tried to induce her sexually by telling his conjugal differences with his wife and he developed personal grudge against her as she did not show any interest in him. The said complaint was followed by another similar complaint dt.28.3.2011(Annexure-A3). A preliminary investigation team visited STC, Medak instead of Eluru and questioned some of the hostel inmates who were not even borne during early 1990s and submitted a report. A Sexual Harassment Committee(SHC) was formed in the year 2012 which was headed by Mrs.Shamshad Banu Nazeer who is none other than the complainant's school and college mate and bosom friend of her. Treating the complaints as charge sheet, the Committee recorded the evidence of the complainant on 24.4.2012 asking her certain suggestive questions matching to the definition of the sexual harassments i.e. verbal, visual, psychological and physical harassments. The complainant said 'yes' to all such questions and her evidence was treated as proof, though her evidence lacks specific dates, events, place, materials, any witness etc. The applicant was also questioned and cross questioned. He denied the charges and explained that there was no chance for both to meet at any point of time as they never worked at one office/place. The IO/chairperson herself questioned and cross questioned the witnesses vide proceedings dtd.24.4.2012(Annexure-A4). A punishment order was issued on 9.4.2013 reducing the applicant's pay by two stages for a period of two years(Annexure-A5). During the same time, he was also transferred to Trivendrum which was questioned by him in OA.291/2013 wherein the Tribunal while granting interim

order on 24.4.2013 noticed that the said enquiry conducted was without following basic principles of natural justice and therefore directed the respondents to conduct another de-novo enquiry and granted status quo to the transfer order(Annexure-A6). Then the respondents had withdrawn the said order of punishment on 18.7.2013(Annexure-A7) and constituted another SHC headed by Smt.Chitra Gangadharan (a Member of earlier committee) on 12.8.2013(Annexure-A8). The respondents have also issued a letter dtd.18.11.2013(Annexure-A9) stating that the complaint forwarded by the Disciplinary Authority(DA) to the SHC is treated as charge sheet and hence issue of further charge sheet is not required. The OA.291/2013 was dismissed holding the OA was premature as it was filed on the basis of internal correspondence proposing his transfer to Trivandrum. Subsequently, he was transferred to Imphal against which he filed another OA.362/2015 and the Tribunal issued stay order on 23.4.2015(Annexure-A10). In the meanwhile, the 2nd SHC conducted its proceedings on 30.9.2013, 22.10.13, 12.11.13, 8.1.2014 & 4.2.2014. Without attending the de-novo enquiry, Kum.Padmaja Bala, the complainant approached the Tribunal in OA.259/2014 questioning the withdrawal of punishment imposed on the applicant and also to stay the 2nd enquiry. The said OA was dismissed on 11.6.2015 with cost(Annexure-A11). After holding four sittings, the respondents issued a charge sheet to the applicant on 26.10.2015(Annexure-A12) framing fresh charges exactly matching the definition of the sexual harassment as defined under the Act, which are as under:

Mr.K.V.Nancharaiah while functioning as Field Assistant at SAI SPDA Centre, Eluru during the year 1990 is alleged to have sexually harassed Ms.Padmaja Bala, KKK Coach by narrating her stories of his conjugal differences with his wife and tried to induce her sexually.

This act on part of Mr.K.V.Nanchariah, then Field Assistant is a serious misconduct which amounts to his unbecoming an employee of SAI and indulging in an Act of Sexual Harassment of woman at her work place and thus is in-contravention of Rule 3 (I) (iii) and 3-C(I) of CCS(Conduct) Rules 1964.

Article-II

The said Mr.K.V.Nanchariah while functioning as Jr.Accountant is alleged to have harassed Ms.Padmaja Bala, KKK Coach on account of her not fulfilling of his sexual desires and started taking every opportunity to tarnish her image. He pressurised the In-charge of STC, Medak Centre to lodge a complaint against her.

This act on part of Mr.K.V.Nanchariah, Jr.Accountant is a serious misconduct which amounts to his unbecoming an employee of SAI and indulging in an Act of Sexual Harassment of woman at her work place and thus is in-contravention of Rule 3 (I) (iii) and 3-C(I) of CCS(Conduct) Rules 1964.

Article-III

That the said Mr.K.V.Nanchariah while functioning as Sr.Accountant at SAI NSSC, Bangalore on account of his appointment as a member of the committee, used the un-parliamentary language against Ms.Padmaja Bala, KKK Coach during the enquiry with In-charge Officer and the staff of STC, Medak Centre tarnishing her image and assassinating her character.

This act on part of the said Mr.K.V.Nanchariah, Sr.Accountant is a serious misconduct which amounts to his unbecoming an employee of SAI and indulging in an Act of Sexual Harassment of woman at her work place and thus is in-contravention of Rule 3 (I) (iii) and 3-C of CCS(Conduct) Rules 1964.

Article-IV

That the said Mr.K.V.Nanchariah presently functioning as Sr.Accountant at SAI NSSC, Bangalore finding opportunity, has mentally and physically harassed Ms.Padmaja Bala, KKK Coach by his visual, verbal and physical actions frequently, putting her into an embarrassing position.

This act on part of the said Mr.K.V.Nanchariah, Sr.Accountant is a serious misconduct which amounts to his unbecoming an employee of SAI and indulging in an Act of Sexual Harassment of woman at her work place and thus is in-contravention of Rule 3 of (I) (iii) and 3-C of CCS(Conduct) Rules 1964.

2. The applicant replied to it on 12.11.2015(Annexure-A13). The evidence copies of the complainant and her witnesses during the first enquiry were shown as

supporting documents at Annexure-III to the charge sheet along with her three written complaints. Thereafter, a preliminary sitting was held on 3.3.2016 and regular sittings were held on 17.3.16, 18.3.16 & 19.3.16. During the enquiry, the Presenting Officer(PO) asked the complainant to confirm her statements in the 1st enquiry and marked those copies of evidence statements recorded in the 1st enquiry as documents on behalf of the CW in the present enquiry, in spite of the fact that the Defence Assistant objected to the same. The PO also submitted a written brief dtd.13.4.2016(Annexure-A14) stating that it is to be presumed that the applicant harrassed the complainant and it is to be implied that charges are true because none of the defence witnesses have questioned the charges. The applicant has also submitted his written brief on 5.6.2016 (Annexure-A15) and explained that the complainant herself admitted that they never worked together and only two three times they met for all these years and the applicant used to harrass her even in her absence while answering question 19 and 20 in the cross examination and only date she remembered was 13.6.2009 which was second Saturday(not working day) and the eye witness Rajinder Kumar also admitted in the evidence that he was not present on that day. The IO without considering any of the contentions of the applicant but only believing the version of the complainant, submitted report on 8.10.2016(Annexure-A16) concluding the charges as proved. The applicant submitted his reply on 23.1.2017(Annexure-A17). The DA without taking into consideration various points raised by the applicant etc., issued the impugned order of punishment of compulsory retirement with immediate effect vide order dtd.17.5.2018(Annexure-A18). He submits that he has been already suffered a lot because of false allegations and his reputation inside and outside the family has been damaged and with the

punishment of compulsory retirement, a permanent stigma will be attached to him for no mistake on his part. When the applicant submitted an appeal on 14.6.2018(Annexure-A19) to the 1st respondent furnishing the copies of the depositions dtd.17.3.2016 & 18.3.2016(Annexures-A20 & A21 respectively) in support of his case, the appellate authority considered the same and passed an order on 27.09.2018(Annexure-A22) without application of mind and the same is unreasoned and non-speaking order. Though the appellate authority has mentioned Rule 27 of CCS(CCA) Rules, they have not discussed anything about many grounds raised by the applicant with regard to the violation of the mandatory procedure to be followed in a departmental inquiry and held that no discrepancies have been noticed. Since the order of the appellate authority is arbitrary, illegal and not in accordance with rules and the applicant is left over with only 2 years of service, he filed the present OA seeking the following relief:

- a. *Call for the records and on perusal quash the order contained in the letter SAI/KER/SH/2018/135 dated 17.05.2018 issued by the 4th respondent as at Annexure-A18 as unjust and illegal and also quash and set aside the order No.F.No.SAI/Pers/221/2012 dt.27.9.2018 passed by the respondent No.2, in the interest of justice & equity.*
 - b. *Consequently direct the respondents to reinstate the applicant into the service and extend all consequential benefits including the arrears of salary with interest at the rate of 18% pa in the interest of justice.*
3. Per contra, the respondents have submitted in their reply statement that pursuant to a complaint made against the applicant, a Sexual Harassment Committee(SHC) was constituted in 2012 under Rule 14 of the CCS(CCA) Rules, 1965. Pursuant to the enquiry, the Committee opined that the allegations made against the applicant were established and the DA concurred that the applicant committed sexual harassment of the complainant Ms.Padmaja Bala. Accordingly, vide order dtd.9.4.2013, the DA awarded a punishment of withholding two

increments with cumulative effect. However, the applicant preferred to move this Tribunal in OA.No.291/2013 which was disposed of with direction to the respondents to conduct a de-novo enquiry. Accordingly, the respondents had withdrawn the allegations and proceeded to conduct a de-novo enquiry and after holding detailed deliberations and taking into account each and every submission, the SHC vide its report dtd.8.12.2016 reached the conclusion that all the charges against the applicant stood proven. Accordingly, DA has imposed the punishment of compulsory retirement vide order dtd.17.5.2018 against the applicant which is legally valid and has been passed in accordance with law. Pursuant to the impugned order dtd.17.5.2018, an appeal was filed by the applicant to the 1st respondent who vide order dtd.27.9.2018 has dismissed the same.

4. The respondents submit that the applicant was assigned to visit SAI STC Medak every month to attend day-to-day accounts and he utilized this opportunity to harass one Ms.Padmaja Bala who was also working at SAI, STC, Medak. The applicant himself has furnished his working details and that of Ms.Padmaja Bala and hence it is a matter of evidence that both the applicant and Ms.Padmaja Bala were known to each other for the past 33 years and that both of them were working in the same place in Eluru in the early 1990s. The matter pertains to the harassment of Ms.Padmaja Bala by the applicant and the appointment of the applicant as a member of the Committee to enquire into the incident of altercation between the athletes and the locals, has no relevance to the instant case and the report of the Committee is also not in evidence. It is a fact that when the 1st enquiry was conducted without cross examination of the witnesses, the same was rectified by the de-novo enquiry as per the orders of the Tribunal.

While initially the complaint itself was treated as a charge sheet, the same was later rectified and articles of charge as well as statement of imputation were separately issued later. It is pertinent to note that the applicant, in spite of the discretion available to him, did not cross examine the complainant on any of the aspects. The issue as to whether the applicant and the complainant had worked together has no relevance, however, the circumstances and situations which brought them together at Eluru and Medak has been clearly brought out during the course of enquiry. The incident dtd.13.6.2009 has been proved beyond any doubt. The applicant has been adequately dealt with by the SHC which has looked into all the evidence with respect to the matter. The CCS(CCA) Rules of 1965 permit the taking on record of statements of witnesses recorded earlier and admitted by them instead of recording the evidence of witnesses de-novo. The appointment of Smt.Gangadharan as the chairperson of the committee is as per rules and does not suffer from any anomaly. There is no bar as such in appointing a member from the 1st Standing Complaints Committee. The Tribunal ordered that the applicant should be given an opportunity to cross examine the witness. The applicant filed the appeal dtd.14.6.2018 against the punishment order and without even waiting for statutory period of six months, he rushed to the Tribunal by filing this OA. However, during the pendency of the OA, the appellate authority has considered and disposed of the appeal by order dtd.27.9.2018. The applicant contended that the appellate authority has not applied its mind and passed an unreasoned and non-speaking order. On perusal of the order dtd.27.9.2018, it cannot be termed as it is a non-speaking order. The further contention of the applicant that the appellate authority has not discussed anything about Rule 27 of CCS(CCA) Rules is also not correct. In the

penultimate para of the order of the appellate authority, it is very clear that the appellate authority has referred to the said rules and came to the conclusion that there is no valid ground for interfering with the order of the disciplinary authority since no discrepancies have been noticed either in the matter of procedure adopted or conclusion reached by the DA. Since the applicant has not made any case for quashing the order of compulsory retirement, the OA is liable to be dismissed.

5. The 4th respondent has filed reply statement stating that she adopted the reply statement filed by the official respondents. She further submits that the detailed enquiry having been conducted on two occasions, the applicant has been held guilty and thereafter, he has been subjected to departmental enquiry proceedings. The records speak by itself to show that due opportunity has been given to the applicant and only after recording the evidence, he has been held guilty and subjected to the punishment. The complaint given by the 4th respondent before the authority is self-explanatory and is also supported by her evidence and several other officials. The report of the IO is also clear and having regard to the nature of the misconduct, the punishment has been imposed. Accordingly, the 4th respondent has no role to play than to pray that the charge made against the applicant which involves moral turpitude and integrity and misbehaviour with the co-official has to be looked into seriously and the punishment has to be imposed.
6. We have heard the Learned Counsel for both the parties and perused the materials placed on record in detail. The 4th respondent, the complainant has given her deposition before the Court in support of her contention which is reproduced below in brief:

“Myself and the applicant have worked in Eluru for some time and I was a Kabaddi & Kocko Coach and the applicant was a Field Assistant. We both belong to same village and same community. I used to stay in Hostel and I never used to speak to him. During the time when we used to travel together from Eluru to my village by train, he used to propose me saying his family problems regarding his second marriage and when he advanced himself in improper way, I shouted at him. But I never complained about this in the department. When I moved from Eluru to Medak, the applicant used to find out my whereabouts like where I am staying, with whom I am meeting and with whom I am talking and so on. He used to come to Medak for doing Accounts and there he used to ask my particulars like what is my work. For which he was warned that this is very bad asking her particulars. He used to come to office on second Saturdays and Sundays in the guise of work in Medak. In Kabaddi discipline, I have to work for National Games almost all the time, University Games and State Games also. Wherever I go, he used to come there. Many warned him saying that why you are after her every time. Even then, he did not rectify himself. When there was some clash between the local people and hostel inmates in Medak when I was on leave, the department has ordered for inquiry wherein the applicant was appointed as a Member. As soon as I joined, the department asked me to attend the enquiry at Hyderabad. Even though I have no role in that matter, I attended the inquiry several times. I used to travel from my place only to attend the inquiry in Hyderabad when all others were staying there itself. I have very old parents to look after. Whenever, I did not attend, the applicant used to make loose comments to tarnish my image. Many a time he used to make very loose talk assassinating my character. After my repeated complaints, the inquiry was conducted on sexual harassment case.

7. The matter in this case has come up before this Tribunal earlier in OA.No.291/2013 wherein since no opportunity was granted to the applicant (who is also the applicant in the present OA) when the witnesses were apparently examined by the Committee, the respondents were directed ad interim to conduct another de-novo enquiry with notice to the applicant so that the witnesses shall be examined in his presence and opportunity was granted to cross-examine them. This OA was finally dismissed holding it as premature on the ground that the transfer order of the applicant was only an internal correspondence and not a final order of transfer. The applicant once again came before us in OA.No.362/2015 against the order of his transfer to Imphal. A further litigation came up vide OA.No.259/2014 wherein the complainant against the

applicant one Smt.Padmaja Bala was the applicant and she had in fact sought to quash the denovo inquiry on the ground that the punishment has already been imposed upon the applicant. This Tribunal noted that the respondents had rightly withdrawn the order of punishment since it was imposed wrongly without giving an opportunity of being heard to the concerned affected person. The Tribunal noted that the punishment order was no longer in force and the respondents themselves had ordered for a denovo inquiry based on the appreciation of the above facts. The OA filed by Smt.Padmaja Bala was dismissed on 11.6.2015. In the present OA, the applicant is challenging the order of punishment meted out vide Annexure-A18 dtd.17.5.2018 and the subsequent rejection of his appeal vide Annexure-A22 dtd.27.9.2018 wherein the punishment of compulsory retirement issued against him has been upheld. From the proceedings of the inquiry conducted by the respondents, it is clear that adequate opportunity has been given to the applicant for cross-examining the witnesses. The applicant has noted that the respondents have made use of the statements given by the complainant and other documents as were presented in the initial inquiry which based on the interim order of this Tribunal and subsequently by the respondents themselves resulted in a de-novo inquiry to provide adequate opportunity to the applicant to cross-examine the witnesses. He has also been allowed to furnish additional defence documents as well as bring in additional defence witnesses. The Chairperson of the present Inquiry Committee was a Member in the earlier committee and this has also been objected to by the applicant. The applicant rests his case mainly on the point that till 2010, the complainant had not made any complaint against him alleging sexual harassment by him right from the beginning period of their careers at Eluru from the early 1990's. While the

complainant was working in Medak, the applicant was made part of a committee to enquire into certain clashes in the premises of the Sports Authority of India at Medak and the applicant was also deputed to check the accounts in the said office from 2008-2010. Apparently, the earlier complaints of the sexual harassment against the applicant by the complainant started resurfacing when the applicant was deputed for attending to certain official duties from 2008-2010 leading first to the complaint dtd.6.11.2010 wherein originally the complainant mentioned that the applicant wanted to dictate terms and conditions in coaching and selection of the players and since she did not yield, he started having personal grudge against her and started harassing her. A subsequent petition was given by the complainant on 20.3.2011 with almost the same points mentioned with the addition of the sexual harassment complaint due to her being single, he being married at that time. The same was reiterated on 28.3.2011 by the complainant. The applicant would claim that since complainant never used to attend to her duties regularly at Medak, in order to protect herself, she had raised these complaints. As we have already seen, due to the opportunity not being given to him in the earlier inquiry, based on the interim order of this Tribunal and on their volition, the respondents had commenced a de-novo inquiry with the original complaints as well as statements recorded in the earlier inquiry. On the side of the applicant, it has to be admitted that the complaints of sexual harassment did not emanate in the early 1990's as was stated by the applicant but only in November 2010 probably due to the re-emergence of the applicant in the official working spot of the complainant. What transpired in between is not part of the inquiry. The applicant would also urge that no specific dates relating to the harassment are mentioned and in fact the complainant would go to the extent

of alleging that she was being harassed even in her absence. The applicant is stated to have made derogatory remarks against her which is confirmed by one of the witnesses, the Station In-charge. But the applicant would refute this point stating that the Station In-charge had a personal grudge against him since he had made him repay certain amounts to the respondent organisation. Some of the defence witnesses had also changed their statements during the enquiry and the inquiry committee considered the fact that none of the defence witnesses had challenged the veracity of the charges that had been made against the applicant. From the proceedings, it is apparent that the applicant and the complainant had known each other for a long time and they both belong to the same community from Andhra Pradesh. It is a fact that the complainant had not raised any issue about the harassment in the early 1990's but chose to start the proceedings only in November, 2010. The applicant did not choose to cross-examine the complainant for reasons best known to him even during the subsequent de-novo enquiry. It is also a fact that he was visiting the work place of the complainant at Medak during 2008-2010 which might have given rise to further complaints on harassment. The inquiry committee had also stated that normally lady officers would not try to make such complaints unless there was substantial justification and certain behaviour of the applicant was also corroborated by an independent witness viz. the Station In-charge. While the earlier order of punishment was reduction of pay in two stages without cumulative effect for a period of two years, the latter punishment vide Annexure-A18 was a severe one leading to the compulsory retirement of the applicant. This has also been upheld vide Annexure-A22.

8. From the foregoing, it is apparent that there was some kind of harassment by the applicant against the complainant over a long period of time and the applicant also had not chosen to cross-examine the complainant at the time of the inquiry. Even though concrete irrefutable evidence was not brought forward to support the complainant except the statement by the Station in-charge, it is apparent that the complaint was not without basis. Taking note of the fact that the applicant also has his own family, it will meet the ends of justice if the severe punishment of compulsory retirement is modified to any appropriate lesser punishment by the respondents. In fact when the earlier punishment was given, the complainant herself had filed the OA.No.259/2014 to quash the de-novo inquiry based on the fact that the punishment has already been imposed on the applicant. The OA is therefore disposed of with the above orders and respondents are directed to issue necessary orders accordingly within a period of three(3) months from the date of issue of this order. Since the applicant is out of service based on the order at Annexure-A18, for the intervening period, he will not be eligible for any monetary benefits and any salary and allowances will be with respect to a prospective date only. No costs.

(C.V.SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)
MEMBER (J)

/ps/

Annexures referred by the applicant in OA.No.170/01403/2018

Annexure-A1: Copy of the complaint dt.6.11.2010
Annexure-A2: Copy of the revised complaint dt.20.3.2011
Annexure-A3: Copy of the repeated complaint dt.28.3.2011
Annexure-A4: Proceedings of the 1st SHC dt.24.4.2012
Annexure-A5: 1st punishment order dt.9.4.2013

Annexure-A6: Order in OA No.291/13 dt.23.4.2013
Annexure-A7: Copies order dt.18.7.2013
Annexure-A8: Copy of the order dt.12.8.2013
Annexure-A9: Copy of the letter dt.18.11.2013
Annexure-A10: Interim order in OA.No.362/15 dt.23.4.2015
Annexure-A11: Order in OA.No.259/14 dt.11.6.2015
Annexure-A12: Charge sheet dt.26.10.2015
Annexure-A13: Reply to charge sheet dt.12.11.2015
Annexure-A14: Written brief of the PO dt.13.4.2016
Annexure-A15: Written brief of the applicant dt.5.6.2016
Annexure-A16: Committee Report dt.8.12.2016
Annexure-A17: Reply to the report dt.23.1.2017
Annexure-A18: Punishment order dt.17.5.2018
Annexure-A19: Appeal dt.14.6.2018 with Proof of Service
Annexure-A20: Proceedings of 2nd SHC dt.17.3.2016
Annexure-A21: Proceedings dt.18.3.2016

Annexures with MA.512/2018 filed by the applicant:

Annexure-A22: Copy of the order dt.27.9.2018

Annexures with reply statement:

-NIL-

Annexures with additional reply statement:

-NIL-

Annexures with MA.92/2019 filed by the applicant:

-NIL-

Annexures with reply statement of 4th respondent:

-NIL-
