## CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI



CCP No. 153/95 in QA No.1249/94

003 14.75	100/ 50 2	, , ,		
MAK KAK KOK	KYMAR.	/19	Decided on:	6-12-96.
La	lman & 2 others	Periodo established de la companya	•••••• A	PPLICANT(S
(By Ashaci	Mrs. Raman Ober	oi	_ Advocate)	
	. U	ERSUS		· .
IÖI	& Ors.	و المعادلة ا	•••••• RE	SPON DEN TS
(By Shri	P.3 Mahendru.	Mile fullified with sproves viryalizating	Advo <sub>cate</sub> )	
D RAM				
THE HON	BLE SHRI S.R.AI	DIGE MEMBE	iq (A ) 。	
THE HON!	BLE SHREKSMXXXD	R. A.VEDA	/ALLI MEMBER (	F)
1. 7	o be referred to	the Repo	rter or not?	Yes.
	hether to be ci of the Tribunal		to other Benc	les

(S.R.ADIGE)
MEMBER(A).

CENTRAL ADMIN ISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENGA

C.C.P No.153/95

IN

0 .A .Mo . 1249/94

New Delhi: this the 6 day of Dac . 1995 HON'BLE MR S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A). HON'BLE DR .A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J).

Lalman,
House No.1335,
Rohtas Nagar East,
Gali No.4,
Shahdara.
Delhi - 110032.

2. Naseem, 124, Shah Jada Bagh., Inderlok De lhi = 110035.

3. Hambans, 1/3500 Ram Nagar, Mandoli Road, Shahdara, De lhi.= 110032

.....Applic ants .

(By Mrs. Paman Oberoi , Advocate)

## Versus

- 1. Union of India through the General Manager, Shri V.K.Agarwal,
  Northern Railway,
  Baroda House,
  New De Ihi.
- Shri M.Z.Ansari, Div. Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Moradabad
- 3. Shri Ashutosh, Asstt. Engineer, Asstt. Pailway Hapur,

.... Pespondents.

(By Advocate: Shri PS Mahendru.)

0



## JUDGMENT

## BY HON'BLE MR . S . R . AD IGE MEMBER (A)

We have heard applicants' counsel

Mrs. Oberoi and respondents' counsel Shri

Mahendru on CCP No.153/95 pressed by the

applicants alleging contumacious disobedience

of the Tribunal's judgment dated 17.10.94

in OA No.1249/94 Shri Lalman & others Vs. Dissert

- 2. By that judgment respondents were directed to treat the applicants as being included in the Live Casual Labour register and also to assign them work if and when necessity for the same arose strictly in accordance with their names appearing in that register.
- 3. Applicants allege that they have not been engaged although 9 of their juniors (named in the CCP) are employed.
- that three out of the 9 are senior to all the applicants; five of them are junior to applicants, while applicant Harbans Singh is senior to only Chidha Singh and applicant Nesero is junior to all. It is further stated that Sheoraj Singh, who is one of the 9 mentioned above was re-engaged on the clear directions of CAT in OA No.1357/94. It is further stated that that persons who had been reengaged erroneously in preference to their juniors, were served a

show cause notice as to why they should not be discharge from service and upon receipt of their replies all these 9 persons except Sheoraj Singh have been discharged vide letter dated 24.5.96.

- have subsequently obtained an exparte star order passed on 27.9.96 in OA No.1361/96 and are continuing on the strength of that interin stay order.
- applicant Lalman is admittedly senior to Sheoral he should be directed to be engaged. Shril Mahendru states that there are persons senior to Lalman and any direction in favour of Lalman at this stage will give rise to similar claims on the part of those senior to him.
- 7. We find that in similar circumstances C.P.No.166/95 was dismissed by our order dated 20.9.96.
- out by respondents, we are satisfied that adequate grounds do not exist to proceed against them for Contempt of Court, and a CCP cannot be used to secure an order to engage operson when there are others senior to him emailing employment. The rulings cited by Mrs. Oberois namely, 1978 Cr.L.J. 789 and 1985 Cr.L.J 1030 are not relevant.

9. Nalkyal The CCP is the efore dismissed and natices against contemnors are discharged.

(DR.A. VEDAVALLI)

MEMBER (J).

(S.O.ADIGE ).
MEMBER (A).

/ug/