

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

CP 211/97 in  
OA No. 1691/94

New Delhi, this the 3rd day of September, 1997

Hon'ble Dr. Jose P. Verghese, Vice-Chairman(J)  
Hon'ble Shri K. Muthukumar, Member (A)

1. Sh. Sohanbir Singh,  
TGT Sc.B.  
Govt. Boys Model School,  
East of Loni Road,  
Delhi.
2. Smt. Shashi Bala  
TGT Skt.,  
Govt. Composit Model School,  
E-Block, Nand Nagri,  
Delhi.
3. Shri Krishan Pal Singh,  
TGT Sc.B.,  
Govt. Boys Sec. Model School,  
Gokulpur village, Delhi.
4. Meenu Dutta,  
TGT Sc.B.,  
Govt. Girls Model School,  
East of Loni Road,  
Delhi.
5. Harpal Singh,  
TGT Skt.,  
Govt. Boys Sec. School,  
D-Block, Nand Nagri,  
Delhi.
6. Shri Roop Singh,  
TGT Hindi,  
Govt. Boys Sr. Sec. School,  
Seelampur, Delhi.
7. Shri Naresh Pal,  
TGT Skt.,  
Govt. Boys Sr. Sec. School,  
West Jyoti Nagar,  
Delhi.
8. Lekh Pal Singh,  
TGT Hindi,  
Govt. Boys Composites Sr. Sec. School,  
Khajori Khas,  
Delhi.

...Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri U. S. Chaudhary)

Versus

1. Smt. Satbir Sialas,  
Directorate of Education,  
Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi,  
Old Sectt., Delhi.

2. Shri S.C. Sareen,  
Joint Director of Education(A)  
Directorate of Education,  
Old Sectt., Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Arun Bhardwaj)

O R D E R (ORAL)  
[Dr. Jose P. Verghese, Vice-Chairman (J)]

The petitioners' counsel states that the order complained against directing the pay fixation of the petitioners after the seniority list is expeditiously finalised, has not been complied with.

Respondents have today, in response to our notice, filed an affidavit alongwith the final seniority list to which the petitioners have no objection. The objection is with regard to the orders passed in pay fixation of the petitioners stating that the pay fixation has been done only upto the year 1996 while it should have been calculated upto 1.1.1997. The petitioner also is taking an objection with respect to para No. 2 wherein an undertaking is sought in the event of any mistake in computing the pay fixation. We do not find that the said undertaking is necessary to protect the respondents' interest regarding the unforeseen mistakes and the pay fixation for 1.1.1997 will be done in due course.

Petitioners' counsel also contends that the actual payment has not been received by them. It was stated by the respondents' counsel that the payment has

-p- (21)

already been sent to the PAO and it is expected that the applicants will receive the same not later than four weeks from today. In the event, if any further delay occurs, liberty is given to the petitioners to revive this C.P. by way of an MA.

In view of the circumstances, these contempt of courts proceedings are dropped and notices discharged.

  
(K. Muthukumar)  
Member (A)

  
(Dr. Jose P. Verghese)  
Vice-Chairman (J)