

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

CP 700/2012
in
OA 2130/2002

(6)

New Delhi this the 4th day of February, 2013

Hon'ble Mr. G. George Paracken, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)

Shri S.K.Thakral,
S/o Late Shri S.R.Thakral,
R/o E-54, Marg 14, Saket,
New Delhi-110017

.. Applicant

(Applicant present in person)

VERSUS

Union of India & Others
Through

1. Shri Shashi Kant Sharma, IAS
Defence Secretary,
Ministry of Defence, South Block,
New Delhi-110011
2. Lt. Gen. Vijay Sharma,
Engineer-in-Chief
Integrated HQ of MoD (Army),
Kashmir House, Rajaji Marg,
New Delhi-110011
3. Sh. Ajay Mishra, IDAS
Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions)
Draupdighat,
Allahabad-211014.

... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri D.S.Mahendru)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Mr. G. George Paracken, Member (J):

This Contempt Petition has been filed for the alleged non-implementation of the order dated 19.4.2005 of this Tribunal in OA-2130/2002. The operative part of the aforesaid order reads as under:-

"In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the time which the entire procedure for promotion has to take, we are of the considered view that the applicant should be considered by the ACC afresh for grant of notional promotion at least from 30.6.2000. In case the applicant is promoted to the post of Addl. DGW from the date of 30.6.2000 his pay and allowances shall be refixed as

✓

on 30.6.2000 notionally and he would be granted pension and other pensionary benefits on the basis of the revised pay. This process shall be completed within four months from the date on which the copy of this order is received by them."

2. Today, when the matter was taken up for consideration, Applicant who is present in person has submitted that pursuant to the aforesaid directions he has been promoted to the post of Addl. DGW w.e.f. 30.6.2000 and his pay has been refixed from the same date notionally. He has also submitted that in accordance with the aforesaid directions, revised PPO order has also been issued. The applicant has also shown us the copy of the revised PPO issued to him by the respondents.

3. In view of above position, we do not find any contempt of court subsists in the present Contempt Petition. Accordingly the same is dismissed. Notices issued to the alleged contemnors are discharged.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Shekhar Agarwal)
Member(A)

(G. George Paracken)
Member(J)

/rb/