

Managing Director, Electronic ... vs B. Karunakar on 5 August, 1991

Equivalent citations: [1992(65)FLR185], JT1992(3)SC605, (1992)1SCC709, AIRONLINE 1991 SC 221

Author: K. Jagannatha Shetty

Bench: K. Jagannatha Shetty Shetty, Yogeshwar Dayal

ORDER

K. Jagannatha Shetty, J.

1. In Kailash Chander Asthana v. State of U.P. it has been observed by a bench of three Judges that the question of furnishing a copy of the report of enquiry in disciplinary proceedings held after Forty- second Amendment does not arise. But in Union of India v. Mohd. Ramzan Khan another bench of three Judges had held to the contrary. In the later case it was observed that "we have not been shown any decision of a coordinate or a larger bench of this Court taking this view...". In view of this seeming conflict as to the entitlement of a copy of the enquiry report to the delinquent officer we consider that it is necessary to refer this matter to a larger bench.

2. The special leave is granted only on this question. The papers may be placed before the Chief Justice for Constitution of a larger bench.

3. Since the matter is likely to take a long time for disposal of the matter, any stay order would prejudicially effect the interest of the respondent in whose favour there is an order of reinstatement with liberty reserved for continuing the inquiry. We, therefore, direct that respondent be reinstated in service within a month from today with the payment of one half of the back wages.