

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**



**M.A. No. 811 of 2019
in
OA. No. 1116 of 2017**

Hyderabad, this the 26th day of February, 2020

Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)

1. Gotcha Suryanarayana,
S/o. Adinarayana, Aged about 60 yrs,
Group 'C' Post, Occ: Employee,
O/o. Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam,
R/o. Visakhapatnam.
2. Dadi Appa Rao, S/o. late Appalanaidu, age 60 yrs,
3. Sati Sankara Rao, S/o. late Paydayya, Age 60 yrs,
4. Sorada Simhachalam, S/o. late Appanna, age 62 years,
5. Bandaru Appa Rao, S/o. late Geddappa, Aged about 60 yrs,
6. Gurula Simhachalam, S/o. Ramulu, Aged about 62 yrs,
7. Dewlipilli Appa Rao, S/o. late Gopalam, Aged about 62 yrs,
8. Salapu Lakshmana Rao, S/o. Venkata Rao, Aged about 60 yrs,
9. Chukka Appa Rao, S/o. late Appanna, Aged about 62 yrs,
10. Pedada Appa Rao, S/o. Suryanarayana, Aged about 55 yrs,
11. Gavara Mutyalu, S/o. Narasanna, Aged about 63 yrs,

Applicants 1 to 11 are employee of Naval Dockyard,
Visakhapatnam, R/o. Visakhapatnam.

... Applicants
(By Advocate: Mrs. K. Anitha Swain)

Vs.



1. Union of India, Rep. by its Secretary, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi – 110 011.
2. Admiral Karambir Singh, The Chief of Naval Staff, Integrated Headquarters, Ministry of Defence, Sena Bhavan, PO DHQ, South Block, New Delhi – 110 011.
3. Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, The Flag Officer-Commanding in Chief, Headquarter, Eastern Naval Command, Naval Base, Visakhapatnam – 530 014.
4. Rear Admiral Kiran Deshmukh, The Admiral Superintendent, Naval Dockyard, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam – 531014.
5. The Present Officer in charge of Pension, The Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad – 211014.

...Respondents

(Respondent No.1 is formal party to this petition).

(By Advocate: Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC)

ORDER (ORAL)
{As per B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}



2. MA 811/2019 in OA 1116/2017 was filed seeking implementation of the decision rendered by the Tribunal in the cited OA on 19.12.2017. Applicants claim that the respondents are in receipt of the order of the Tribunal as evidenced by the respondents letter dated 3.03.2018. The apparent ground professed by the applicants is that the applicants are at the verge of their retirement requiring early implementation of the Tribunal verdict under reference. Non implementation of the judgment would tantamount to contempt of the Court.

3. As can be seen from the order of the Tribunal dated 19.12.2007 in the referred OA, time calendared to implement is 8 weeks and it is astonishing to note that the respondents did not choose to implement the direction though much water has flowed in River Ganga from 2017 onwards. Nearly 3 years have elapsed and yet not implementing the order is something the Tribunal is disturbed to note, to say the least. The Tribunal while expressing its placid displeasure at the unusual indifference in implementing the decision for reasons best known to them, directs the respondents to implement the orders of Tribunal in OA 1116/2017 within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of this order provided the order of the Tribunal has not been stayed or suspended or overriding orders have been received from a superior judicial forum. Any further procrastination on behalf of the respondents to honour the verdict, for other than justifiable

reasons, would be gratuitously giving room for unpleasant consequences. Respondents, the Tribunal believes, would do well to take note and do what is expected of them legally.

4. With the above direction, the MA is disposed of, with no order as to costs.



(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

/evr/