

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

“Furthermore, the order of disciplinary authority as also the appellate authority are not supported by any reason. As the orders passed by them have severe civil consequences, appropriate [reasons](#) should have assigned. If the enquiry officer had relied upon the confession made by the appellant, there was no reason as to why the order of [discharge](#) passed by the criminal Court on the basis of selfsame [evidence](#) should not have been taken into consideration. The materials brought on record pointing out the guilt are required to be proved. A decision must be arrived at on some evidence, which is legally admissible. The provisions of the Evidence Act may not be applicable in a departmental proceeding but the principles of [natural justice](#) are. As the report of the enquiry officer was based on merely ipse dixit as also surmises and conjectures, the same could not have been sustained. The inference drawn by the enquiry officer apparently were not supported by any evidence. Suspicion as is well known, however high may be, can under no circumstances be held to be substitute for legal proof.

[2008 SCeJ 001](#)

Tags: [Disciplinary proceedings](#), [Natural Justice - Disciplinary Authority](#), [Quasi Judicial - Departmental Proceedings](#)