135

no.2 is neither the appointing authority of the petitioner nor the disciplinary authority of the petitioner.

c. For that the impugned order dated 24.06.2010 also is issued without any authority.

d. For that the order dated 30th June 2010 is illegal and unlawful basically on the ground that the same has been passed without affording opportunity to the petitioner and without considering the facts that the petitioner has already faced trial once on the same charge and there cannot be second trial for the same charge.

e. For that the respondent authorities failed to consider that the petitioner cannot be made to go through a trial again upon the intervention of his superior.

f. For that the respondent authorities did not consider the provisions of law.

g. For that the respondent authorities deliberately with malafide intention inflicted harassment upon the Petitioner.

h. For that the Respondent authorities without any reason did not consider the grievances of the petitioner.

i. For that the Respondent authorities have violated Articles 14, 15 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

j. For that the orders impugned are arbitrary unlawful and malafide.