

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP.No.220 of 1996
in
OA.No.548/94

(AA)

Dated New Delhi, this 15th day of January, 1997.

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. C. SAKSENA, ACTING CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER (A)

All India Radio and Doordarshan
Stenographers Association, New Delhi through

1. Shri S. M. Rao, its President
News Services Division
All India Radio
NEW DELHI.
2. Shri Anup Kumar
S/o Shri Karam Chand
R/o 1890 Laxmibai Nagar
NEW DELHI.
3. Shri N. Karunakaran
R/o 388 Sector-V
Pushvihar
NEW DELHI.
4. Shri G. Subramanian
S/o Late Shri S. Ganesa Iyer
R/o A-370 Moti Bagh
NEW DELHI. Petitioners

By Advocate: Shri Jog Singh with
Shri S. Y. Khan

VERSUS

1. Shri N. P. Nawani
Secretary to the
Government of India
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
Shastri Bhavan
NEW DELHI.
2. Shri C. Ramachandran
Secretary to the
Government of India
Department of Expenditure
Ministry of Finance
North Block
NEW DELHI.
3. Shri Shashi Kant Kapoor
Director General
All India Radio
Akashvani Bhavan
Parliament Street
NEW DELHI. Respondents

By Advocate: Shri K.C.D. Gangwani with
Shri K. R. Sachdeva.

1 Contd...2

bci

O R D E R (oral)

(AS)

Mr Justice B. C. Saksena, Acting Chairman

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. The applicants claim parity and applicability on the order passed by a Division Bench of this Tribunal in OA.No.548/94 as also OA.No.144-A of 1993 decided on 19th January, 1996. The applicants to the said OAs were working as the Assistants and Stenographers Grade-II in the Directorate of Field Publicity, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, and Crime Assistants and Stenographers Grade 'C' in the Department of Central Bureau of Investigation in the Ministry of Personnel, & Public Grievances & Pensions respectively. The present applicants are working in All India Radio and Doordarshan as Stenographers. They filed a Contempt Petition on the basis that the benefit of the decision in OA.No.548/94 has not been extended to them by the respondents. The present applicants have not filed any Original Application ~~even~~ ^{as} they are claiming parity with the applicants in OA.548/94.

Unless they file an original application, no question of contempt by the respondents arises. Faced with this situation, the learned counsel for the applicants stated before us that the present

BC2

Contd...2

(Ab)

Contempt Petition is not being pressed. It is
accordingly dismissed.

✓

(K. Muthukumar)
Member (A)

(B. C. Saksena)
Acting Chairman

dbc

B. C. Saksena