

5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

C.P. No.403/2002  
IN  
O.A. No.994/2002

This the 24th day of January, 2003

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri Shankar Prasad, Member (A)

Dr. Bal Krishan  
S/o Sri Nathi Lal (Aged -42)  
C-253, Pocket - 1, Phase- I,  
Mayur Vihar, Delhi-110091.

....Petitioner

(None for the petitioner even on the second call)

Versus

1. Mr. S.K. Naik,  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare,  
Nirmal Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Dr. Sushil Kumar,  
Dean  
Maulana Azad Medical College,  
New Delhi.
3. Dr. Samba Shiv Rao,  
Director  
Jawahar Lal Institute of Post Graduate &  
Medical Research (JIPMER),  
Dhanvantri Nagar,  
Ponndicherry-605006.
4. Dr. Gauri Devi,  
Director,  
National Institute of Mental Health &  
Neuro Sciences,  
Bangalore - 560029.

.....Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri V.S.R. Krishna with Shri K.C.  
Nayak, learned proxy counsel for Shri  
Ram Kwar Dhillon for respondents.)

ORDER (ORAL)

Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman :

This Tribunal had disposed of OA 994/2002 on  
15.4.2002 with the following directions:-

"2. Having regard to the submissions made by  
the learned counsel, we feel inclined to  
dispose of the present OA at this very stage  
even without issuing notices with a direction  
to the respondents to consider the




departmental directions already given on 10.6.1997 and 25.6.1998 expeditiously and convey a proper decision to the applicant within a maximum of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, while doing so, the respondents will also consider the applicant's prayer for condonation of resignation and for this purpose, the present OA will be treated as a representation made by the applicant."


2. The petitioner had preferred the present petition invoking the provisions of contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Section 17 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 assailing that the respondents are showing disregard to the orders passed by this Tribunal.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that presently the respondents have condoned the resignation and benefits in this regard has been given to the petitioner vis-a-vis pay protection. These facts clearly show that the matter in question has been considered.

4. In that view of the matter, Rule is discharged. If the petitioner has still any grievance, he can take up the matter afresh in accordance with law.

5. CP 367/2002 is disposed of.

  
(Shankar Prasad)  
Member (A)

  
(V.S. Aggarwal)  
Chairman

/ravi/