Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench: New Delhi

C.P. No. 21/2002 In O.A. No. 1745/2001

This the 23rd day of May, 2002

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

All India CPWD (MRM) Karamchari Sangathan (Regd.), through its President, Shri Satish Kumar, 34-D, D.I.Z. Area, Sector-4, Raja Bazar, New Delhi-110001.

2. Shri Maan Singh Meena, S/o Shri Ramdhan Meena, Beldar, C/o All India CPWD (MRM) Karamchari Sangathan (Regd.), through its President, 34-D, D.I.Z. Area, Sector-4, Raja Bazar, New Delhi-110001.

-Applicants

(By Advocate: Ms. Shilpa Chohan, proxy for Shri Naresh Kaushik)

Versus

77.

- 1. Shri Krishan Kumar The Director General (Works) CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.
- 2. Shri A. Madhukar Reddy, Director (Administration), CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.
- 3. Shri P.K. Gupta, Superintendeing Engineer, Coordination Circle (Civil) CPWD, I.P. Bhawan, New Delhi-110002.

-Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri B.K. Berera)

ORDER (Oral)

Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

The applicants alleges wilful and contumacious disobedience of this court's order dated 18.7.2001 wherein following directions have been issued:-



"Having said that in our view it will be just and proper even without issuing a notice on the present OA to direct the respondents to decide the representations dated 8.5.2001 and 13.6.2001 (Annexure A-4 & A-5 respectively) of the applicants by a detailed reasoned and speaking order within a period of one month from communication of this order. We direct accordingly. No costs".

- referring to the representations made 2. as well as on 13.6.2001, it is contended in 8.5.2001 para-3 of the representation that respondents have been asked to keep the trade test in abeyance and all the candidates belonging to SC/ST/OBC categories may allowed to submit their applications for trade test the post of Work Assistant as well as they were requested to hold the trade test for one vacancy of ST candidate for applicant No.2 Shri Man Singh Meena. Learned counsel also refers to an observations made by the court in para-3 where it is contended that similarly placed differently and while personnel cannot be treated referring to earlier OA-1825/96, it is contended that a similar test was held by the respondents therein.
- Learned counsel appearing for the respondents present Association which is contended that application of the applicants is not recognised one. Ιt been by is further contended that the trade test has already nover in May, 2001. Further, in their reply it is stated that in pursuance of the directions of the court, representation of the applicant was disposed of by order dated 17.9.2001 and as a follow up action on the recommendation of Director General of Works, it has been decided to conduct trade test for one post of Work Assistant in ST quota under direct recruitment

(12)

Notification has already been issued on 15.2.2002. In this view of the matter, it is contended that there is no wilful and contumacious disobedience on the part of the respondents.

- 4. We have carefully considered the submissions and perused the material available on record.
- Having regard to the ratio of the Apex court in 5. Parihar v. Ganpat Duggar & Ors., 1997 (1) SLJ 236 = JT 1996 (9) SC 611 held that cause of action which arises in implementation of the directions of the court cannot be gone into. We are satisfied that there is wilful disobedience on the part of the respondents as the representation of the applicant was considered dated 17.9.2001 and the disposed of by an order respondents have also initiated the process of holding the trade test for one post of Work Assistant in In the event, applicants are aggrieved by decision of the respondents, it will be open for them to seek the remedy in accordance with law in a separate proceeding.
- 6. Accordingly, for the reasons recorded above, CP is dropped. Notice issued to the respondents are discharged. No costs.

S. Raym

(Shanker Raju) Member (J) (V.K. Majotrá) Member (A)

cc.