

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

CP. NO. 367/2007
OA .No.869 of 1999

New Delhi this the 5th day of November, 2007

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.RAMACHANDRAN, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)
HON'BLE MRS. NEENA RANJAN, MEMBER (A)

1. Central Jail Employee Association,
New Delhi Through its
General Secretary
Shri Brahm Prakash
Tihar Jail,
New Delhi.
2. Shri Ram Dayal Pal
S/o Late Ram Sumer Pal,
Warder
Central Jail No.I
Tihar Jail, New Delhi.

(By Advocate: Sh. Shyam Babu)

Versus

1. Sh. Madukar Gupta,
Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Government of India,
South Block,
New Delhi.
2. Sh. Narain Swami,
Chief Secretary,
Government of N.C.T. of Delhi
Delhi Secretariat Delhi.
3. Shri B.K. Gupta,
Director General Cum I.G. Prison
Tihar Jail Campus
New Delhi

... Respondents.

(By Advocate:None)

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. Ramachandran, VC (J)

OA had been disposed of vide order dated 10.11.2006 with the following directions:-

58

“The claim made by the applicants appear to be reasonable inasmuch the salary and washing allowances had been granted to him in par with Delhi Police personnel. So far as the ration money is concerned, since their service conditions, nature of duties and responsibilities are similar and identical to that of police personnel, therefore, their claim appears to be reasonable and legitimate. Accordingly, we hereby direct Respondents 1 to 3 to consider the claim of the applicants as regards the ration money in par with the Delhi Police within three months from the date of communication of the order.”

It is pointed out that consequently an order has been passed, which is placed at Annexure-A. Shri Shyam Babu appearing on behalf of the applicants states that there is no compliance as the payment has been made only prospectively and also it does not show that whether it is at par with the counterparts of the applicants or not.

2. We find it difficult to approve the contention that there has been a deliberate contempt especially, when there was a direction to consider the issue and the respondents have considered and passed the order, as such, we reluctant to interfere in this application for proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act against the respondents. Therefore, the present Contempt Petition is closed. However, leave is ^{RESERVED} granted to the applicants to file an appropriate application by challenging the said order, in accordance with rules, before the appropriate forum.

NR any an

(Mrs. Neena Ranjan)
Member (A)

M. Ramachandran
(M. Ramachandran)
Vice Chairman (J)

mk