

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. NO. 205/1998  
in  
O.A. NO. 1563/1995

(71)

New Delhi this the 14th day of July, 1998.

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE K. M. AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI R. K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

Sub Inspector (Ex) Rameshwar Singh  
No. D/1850 S/O Dharam Singh,  
Present Posted at I.G.I. Airport,  
R/O H.No. B-279, Prashant Vihar,  
Delhi.

... Applicant

( By Shri Shankar Raju, Advocate )

-Versus-

Shri V. N. Singh,  
Commissioner of Police,  
Police Headquarters,  
I.P. Estate, M.S.O. Building,  
New Delhi.

... Respondent

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice K. M. Agarwal :

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant on admission.

2. This contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance with the directions of the Tribunal dated 24.2.1998 in OA No. 1563/95. The directions were to the following effect :-

"19. The foregoing discussion is sufficient to satisfy us that our judicial intervention is warranted in this matter to this extent that we remand the cases of the applicants before us, back to respondents for reconsideration regarding their inclusion in Promotion List 'F' (Exe) w.e.f. 12.8.94 in accordance with rules and instructions supported by reasons in writing for their


For


3  
42

decision in each case. In case upon such reconsideration respondents find any or all the applicants fit for being brought on to Promotion List 'F' (Exe) w.e.f. 12.8.94 and consequent promotion, they will be entitled to consequential benefits. These directions should be implemented within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs."

3. After this order by the Tribunal it appears the respondents considered the case of the applicant for promotion and informed him by letter dated 19.6.1998 that for the reasons stated his name was not recommended for admission to the Promotion List.

4. The learned counsel submitted that the order is a cryptic order and, therefore, contempt is committed. We are of the view that the directions of the Tribunal have been complied with by consideration of the applicant's name by the review DPC and by issuance of the aforesaid letter dated 19.6.1998 to the applicant. If the applicant feels aggrieved by that order on the ground stated or on any other ground, his remedy is not by way of filing contempt petition but by filing a fresh O.A. challenging the order. Accordingly, we find no case to issue notice against the respondent. The contempt petition is hereby summarily dismissed.

  
( K. M. Agarwal )  
Chairman

  
( R. K. Ahooja )  
Member (A)

/as/