CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL Principal Bench

C.P. No. 355 of 1999 in O.A. No. 2168 of 1994

New Delhi, dated this the 2- AUGUST 2000

HON BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A) HON BLE MR. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

Shri Vinod Kumar, S/o Shri Ramesh Chander, R/o Village & P.O. Pilana, Dist. Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Shankar Raju)

Versus

Shri P. Kamaraj,
Dy. Commissioner of Police, Traffic,
Police Headquarters, I.P. Estate,
M.S.O. Building,
New Delhi. Respondent

(Mrs. Sumedha Sharma)

ORDER

Mr. S.R. Adige, VC (A)

Heard both sides on C.P.No. 355/99

- In the light of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's ruling in J.S.Parihar Vs. G.Duggar & Ors. J.T.1996(9)SC 608, denial of consequential benefits including non-release by respondents of back wages to applicant cannot be said to amount to contumacious disobedience of the Tribunal's order dated 17.8.99 in OA No.2168/94, if on the basis of certain instructions, respondents conclude that applicant is not entitled to the same?
- 3. It is open to applicant to agitate for the same separately in accordance with law, if so advised. Giving liberty to applicant as a foresaid, the C.P. is rejected. No tices discharged.

(KULDIP SINGH)

MEMBER (J)

(S.R.ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN(A)

And tolig!