

IN THE ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH AT NEW DELHI

01.

O. A. No. 234 of 2011

Col Rajesh Tyagi

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

.....Respondents

For petitioner: Sh. Rajiv Manglik, Advocate.

For respondents:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. MATHUR, CHAIRPERSON.

HON'BLE LT. GEN. S.S.DHILLON, MEMBER.

ORDER
02.06.2011

1. The petitioner has earlier been given severe displeasure recordable which has now been converted to severe displeasure non-recordable. Therefore, this is too small a matter to be interfered. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at the time of severe displeasure recordable his ACR has been written by the IO and RO and, therefore, he filed a statutory complaint which was also rejected.

2. We do not want to interfere in the matter. However, we leave it to petitioner to make a representation to the respondents that in changed circumstances and respondents shall reconsider the matter in the light of the order passed by the Chief of the Army Staff dated 24th April 2009 whereby

recorded warning has been made non-recordable. The authorities may consider the matter sympathetically.

3. With these observations, the petition is disposed of with no order as to costs.

A.K. MATHUR
(Chairperson)

S.S. DHILLON
(Member)

New Delhi
June 02, 2011