

M.10

| Noting by Office of<br>or Advocate | Serial<br>No. | Date | Office notes, reports, orders or proceedings with signatures   |
|------------------------------------|---------------|------|--|
|                                    |               |      | <p>The arguments advanced on behalf of the respondent authorities on the point of maintainability of the writ petition are not acceptable since the petitioner was admittedly sent on deputation to the borrowing authority namely, AAJVS and at the relevant time the said petitioner was working in the AAJVS as Executive Secretary. The disputes relating to the service matters of an employee of AAJVS can not be decided by the Central Administrative Tribunal and the same should be adjudicated only by this Court in its constitutional writ jurisdiction.</p> <p>Mrs. Nag submits that in the instant case, Smt.B.Bhamathi had no authority and/or jurisdiction to issue the order dated 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2010 as the disciplinary authority of the petitioner since at the relevant time, the said petitioner was employed in the AAJVS on deputation.</p> <p>Mr.Mandal, learned counsel of the respondents however, submits that the Chief Secretary being the Secretary of the AAJVS is the disciplinary authority of the said petitioner.</p> |

