

Supreme Court of India

Union Of India & Ors vs Jayakumar Parida on 27 November, 1995

Equivalent citations: 1996 SCC (1) 441, JT 1995 (9) 615

Author: K Ramaswamy

Bench: Ramaswamy, K.

PETITIONER:

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:

JAYAKUMAR PARIDA

DATE OF JUDGMENT 27/11/1995

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

HANSARIA B.L. (J)

CITATION:

1996 SCC (1) 441                      JT 1995 (9)      615

1995 SCALE (7) 366

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R Delay condoned.

Leave granted.

The respondent was appointed on March 31, 1989 as an Extra-Departmental Branch Post Master and he had joined the post on May 16, 1989. His appointment was terminated on February 25, 1991. He filed O.A.No.81/91 in CAT at Cuttack. The Tribunal by order dated August 24, 1994 set aside the order of termination on the ground that it did not contain any reason nor any opportunity is given to the respondent. Therefore, it was violative of principles of natural justice. Accordingly, it directed reinstatement of the respondent with all consequential benefits. Thus this appeal by special leave.

Rule 6 of the Posts and Telegraph Extra-Departmental Agents (Conduct and Salaries) Rules, 1964 provides that:

"6. Termination of Services: The service of an employee who has not already rendered more than three years continuous service from the date of his appointment shall be liable to termination by the appointing authority at any time without notice."

The question is whether the termination of the respondent is in accordance with this rule. There appears to be a complaint laid against the respondent that he had produced a false income certificate before seeking appointment. That was taken into account while making the appointment of the respondent as Extra-Departmental Branch Post Master. It is settled law that if any material adverse to the respondent formed a foundation for termination, principles of natural justice may necessarily require that prior opportunity of notice be given and after considering his reply appropriate order may be passed giving reasons in support thereof. If it is only a motive for taking action, in terms of Rule 6, since that rule provides that such a termination could be made within three years without any notice, there would be no obligation on the part of the appellant to issue any notice and to give opportunities before termination. So each case requires to be examined on its own facts.

It was admitted on behalf of the appellants in the counter affidavit filed before the Tribunal that the action was initiated on the basis of a report submitted against the respondent that he had produced false income certificate. In other words, it formed a foundation and not a motive for taking the impugned action. Accordingly, we decline to interfere with the order of the Tribunal setting aside the termination. However, the respondent is not entitled to any backwages.

The appeal is accordingly allowed to the above extent. No costs.