

②

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

O.A. No. 1807/2002

This the 19th day of July, 2002

Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

M.C. Agarwal
R/o WP 509 Village Wazirpur
Ashok Vihar, Delhi-110052.

-Applicant

(Applicant present in person)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through its Secretary
Ministry of Urban Development
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Director General of Works, CPWD
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.

-Respondents

ORDER (Oral)

Heard applicant in person.

2. Applicant has challenged the following:-

i) Respondents' order dated 20.6.2000 (Annexure P-1) whereby he was imposed a penalty of Censure.

ii) According to him, he filed an appeal against that which has not yet been decided by the respondents. He has further challenged respondents' order dated 12.10.2001 (Annexure P-2) disallowing the payment of interest on delayed payment of gratuity. According to him, he had filed an appeal against that vide Annexure P-9 dated 31.10.2001 which has not been decided by respondents despite this Tribunal order dated 12.12.2001 to expedite decision on his appeal.

iii) Lastly, he has assailed respondents' order dated 8.5.98 (Annexure P-3) whereby respondents had refused to treat the period after his retirement on duty.


3. The applicant stated that all these reliefs

[Signature]

are interconnected. The question of in-decision on the part of respondents against punishment of Censure has already been adjudicated by this court in OA-3242/2001 which was decided on 12.12.2001 (Annexure P-10). This matter cannot be taken up again in the present OA. If the respondents have not complied with the orders with the directions of this court, the applicant has to seek relief as per law but not through this OA.

4. As regards, disallowing the payment of interest on delayed payment of gratuity, according to the applicant this matter was dealt with by this Tribunal in Annexure P-10. As regards, applicant's request to treat the period after retirement on duty the applicant stated that he had filed a petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi i.e. CWP-7548/2000 which was dismissed.

5. In my considered view, whereas the applicant had taken up some of the above matter previously in different courts and also that they are not inter-connected, this application is not maintainable and the same is rejected accordingly.


(V.K. Majotra)
Member (A)

cc.