

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

CP-131/2003 in
MA-1023/2003
QA-383/2002
MA-1535/2003

New Delhi this the 21st day of July, 2003.

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice-Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Sh. S.K. Naik, Member(A)

Pawitar Singh Bedi,
S/o Late Sh. Amolak Singh Bedi,
R/o 5327 Shora Kothi, Paharganj,
New Delhi-55. Applicant

(Applicant in person)

Versus

1. Sh. Sanjiv Ranjan,
Deputy Secretary(FSP),
Ministry of External Affairs,
Room No.37, South Block,
New Delhi-11.
2. Smt. Ruchira Kamboj,
Head of Chancery,
Permanent Mission of India to the
United Nations, New York,
C/o Ministry of External Affairs,
South Block, New Delhi-11.
3. Sh. B.B. Pandit,
Director of Audit,
Embassy of India, WASHINGTON,
C/o Ministry of External Affairs,
South Block, New Delhi-11.
4. Sh. Rajiv K. Chander,
Consult General,
Consulate General of India,
ST. PETERSBURG,
C/o Ministry of External Affairs,
South Block,
New Delhi-11. Respondents

(through Sh. H.K. Gangwani, Advocate)

ORDER (ORAL)
Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice-Chairman(J)

We have considered the pleadings on record in
CP-131/2003. We have also considered the applicant's
MA-1023/2003 to which respondents have filed reply. The
applicant has also filed another MA-1535/2003 to which
notices have not been issued so far.

18/

2. In terms of Tribunal's order dated 28.10.2002 read with the order dated 21.2.2003 in MA-159/2003, we are satisfied that the respondents have issued a reasoned and speaking order dated 10.4.2003 after an officer at the level of Joint Secretary has given a personal hearing to the applicant. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we see no force in the submissions of the applicant that the respondents have wilfully disobeyed the Tribunal's order by delaying the issuance of the aforesaid order and that submission is accordingly rejected.

3. We are also further satisfied on a perusal of the aforesaid order dated 10.4.2003 that the respondents have dealt with the claims of the applicant, after giving him a personal hearing. It is another matter if the applicant is not fully satisfied with the action taken by the respondents regarding his claims, which cannot be the subject matter in this contempt petition. The applicant has stated in MA-1535/2003 that with reference to two of the claims made by him, the respondents have passed orders settling those claims by letters dated 30.5.2003 and 30.6.2003. He, however, ^{has, 8;} _✓ vehemently submitted that some of his claims for payments have yet to be settled. It is relevant to note that these claims have also been dealt with by the respondents in their speaking order dated 10.4.2003 and in the circumstances of the case it cannot be held that

82

there is any wilful or contumacious disobedience of Tribunal's aforesaid order, justifying continuation of the contempt petition against the respondents. In this view of the matter, CP-131/2003 is dismissed. Notices to the alleged contemners are discharged. File to be consigned to the record. Accordingly, MA-1023/2003 and MA-1535/2003 are dismissed as not maintainable in CP-131/2003.

Naik
(S.K. Naik)
Member(A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice-Chairman(J)

/vv/