

Regul, 90 /25.7

dr. Taunst

In the matter of submission of information about purchase of new Maruti Alto Lxi car by Smt. Pratibha Saxena, who is presently posted as Judicial Magistrate, Hapur, Ghaziabad, Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.I.Murtaza, vide his Lordship's order dated 22.04.2008 (flagged 'O'), quarried as to how the officer propose to lead a contented life befitting the status of a judicial officer within a meagre amount of Rs. 9746/- only, that remains with her out of the net salary of Rs. 14,930/- after deduction of car loan to the tune of Rs. 5184/-. The order was communicated to the officer concerned vide Court's letter dated 29.04.2008.

Now, in reply of the Court's letter dated 29.04.2008, Smt. Pratibha Saxena, vide her letter dated 21.05.2008 at flag 'X' has stated that: -

- 1. At the time of purchase of the car, she was getting net salary of Rs. 14930/-, which was enhanced to Rs.15840/- only after 1-2 months, Rs. 16573/- in December 2006, Rs. 17656/- in January 2007 and at present became Rs. 19940/-.
- 2. Her husband has his own private business at Delhi and he is also contributing time to time for household expenses.
- 3. Her family is a small family consisting of her husband, residing at Delhi, her son aged about six years, residing with her and her second child born in January 2008.
- 4. She easily manages her monthly household expenses from her net salary and her husband's contribution towards household expenses.

She has also furnished relevant papers in support of her submission alongwith her letter dated 21.05.2008.

May, therefore, if approved, the file be laid before Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.I. Murtaza for His

Lordship kind perusal and further orders in the matter?

Registran (B)

May bindly lay the file before Hon'tele

Mr. twitice M. I. murtaga for His Lordship's bind

persural and further orders in the matter?

Al

21:7:08

T. R. (M)

Submitted for kind period

Oud orders.

Outeaherth

Perused the explanation submitted by the officer in response to the queries made by the Court.

The matter may be relegated to the District Judge concerned where the officer is posted with the request to append his opinion about the authenticity/plausibility of the explanation submitted by the officer attended with his view whether the officer can manage the affairs within the diminished amount that survives with him/her consistent with the dignity of a judicial officer.

I would appreciate if the District Judge makes his opinion available expeditiously.

21.8.2008

Regr. (13)
12-8-08

50 Hamm Ad 5. R. M) 22-8-08

A-WO.

لم