T.A. No. 547/2009

[W.P. (C) No. 7643/1999]

09.03.2010

Present: Maj. (Retd.) K. Ramesh, Advocate, counsel for the petitioner.

Col. (Retd.) R. Balasubramanium, Advocate, counsel for the respondents.

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

We have seen the original ACR and we find that there is a pen picture given by the Initiating Officer bears signature of the petitioner and at Item 11, 6 substitutes for 8 is a mystery but in the overall final assessment, Mr. Aggarwal has given him 8 marks. Therefore, grievance of the petitioner that because of substitution in Item 11 from 8 to 6 has adversely affected his career prospects appears to be misapprehension on his part. Consequently, after seeing the original record, we are satisfied that this might be a typographical error and there is no malice on the part of the Mr. Aggarwal. There is no merit in the petition. Same is dismissed accordingly with no order as to cost.

A.K. MATHUR
(Chairperson)

M.L. NAIDU
(Member)

New Delhi
March 09, 2010