

*hold the further Inquiry according to the provisions of Rule 14, as for as may be."* The authorities vested power for further inquiry which is permissible under the law and the competent authority ordered for the same and as such there is no reason to aggrieved by the Writ Petitioner until final decision was taken by the competent authority on the basis of full inquiry.

25. With reference to statements made in paragraph No.17 of the said Writ Application I deny and dispute the allegations made therein. It is submitted that the though the petitioner is under deputation with Respondent No: 7, he is a DANICS Officer and under the control of Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi therefore this write application is not maintainable before this court.
26. With reference to statements made in paragraph No.18 of the said Writ Application I deny and dispute the allegations made therein. It is submitted that Smti. S.K.P. Sodhi is an IAS Officer and has been appointed as Inquiry officer to hold the inquiry against the petitioner. Her appointment has been made by the competent authority.
27. With reference to statements made in paragraph No.19, 20 & 21 of the said Writ Application I deny and dispute the allegations made therein.
28. With reference to the grounds made in sub-paragraph No. A to K in paragraph No.22 of the said Writ Application I deny and dispute. It is submitted that the none of the ground is tenable under the law and the said application is not maintainable before this court as the applicant is a Central Govt. Employee and covered under the CCS /CCA rules and the dispute raised by him related to the service as such the Central Administrative Tribunal is empowered to deal with the matter.