

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

G.P. 198/95

in

O.A. 36/94

(24)

This the 10th day of July, 1996.

HON'BLE SHRI S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALI, MEMBER (J)

Ramesh Chand
S/o Sh. Shimbu Ram,
R/o RZF-117/2, St. No. 40,
Sadh Nagar-II, Palam Colony,
New Delhi. Applicant.
(By Advocate Sh. Yogesh Sharma)

Versus

Shri R.M. Aggarwal,
Divisional Manager,
Norther Railway, Bikaner Division,
Bikaner. (Rajasthan). Respondent.
(By Advocate Sh. K.K. Patel)

ORDER (oral)

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Member (A)

1. We have heard Shri Yogesh Sharma, counsel
for the applicant and Shri K.K. Patel, counsel
for the respondent.

2. Shri Sharma contends that the Respondent's
order dated 11.11.95, is not in full compliance
of the Tribunal's judgement dated 1.3.95 in
O.A. 36/94 Ramesh Chand Vs. UOI and other connected
cases, ^{and} has not taken into account the relevant

A

(25)

circular issued by the respondent, on the subject.

3. We have perused the contents of the respondent's letter dated 11.11.95. It is well settled that the purpose of a CCP is to ^{instill} ~~in~~ respect for judicial orders and decorum in the judicial process, and cannot be pressed, to ventilate the private rights of an individual. Manifestly a perusal of respondent's letter dated 11.11.95 shows that there has been no wilful, deliberate or contumacious violation of the Tribunal's judgement dated 1.3.95, more particularly as the said order is a detailed and speaking one.

4. In the event that the applicant is aggrieved by the decision taken by the respondent and communicated to him by letter dated 11.11.95 it is open to him to agitate the matter in accordance with law if so advised. A CCP is not the proper instrument for such a purpose.

5. Under the circumstances the CCP is rejected and notice against the respondent are discharged. No costs.

A. Vedavalli

RB

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)
Member (J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. Adige)
Member (A)