

(11)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. NO.137/1998

in

O.A. NO. 958/1997

New Delhi this the 13th day of May, 1998.

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

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

1. Chandra Mohan Bector
S/o S. K. Bector,
R/o C-182, DDA (MIG) Flats,
Saket, New Delhi.
2. Mrs. Shahnaz Yusuf,
D/o late Shri A. K. Khan,
R/o B-327, New Friends Colony,
New Delhi.
3. Shri Birender Kumar
S/o Shri Rajeshwar Nath,
R/o Akash Darshan Apartments,
Mayur Vihar, New Delhi.
4. Ms. Madhu Mathuur,
D/o late Shri P. S. Mathur,
R/o B-3/44, Janakpuri,
New Delhi.

... Applicants

(By Shri S. Y. Khan, Advocate)

-Versus-

Shri P. G. Mankad,
Secretary,
Ministry of Information &
Broadcasting, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.

... Respondent

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice K. M. Agarwal :

Heard the learned counsel for the applicants on.
the application for contempt.

2. The operative part of the order made in OA
958/97 is as follows :-

Jm

(12)

A
"In the circumstances, respondents are directed to treat the petitioners as regular with effect from 4/9-6.1993 for all purpose including seniority and further promotions etc."

3. As we read the order, nothing appears to be required to be done by the respondents. If subsequent to the date of this order, the applicants feel that any person junior to them has been promoted ignoring their seniority pursuant to the aforesaid order, they may come before us. The applicants are deemed to be regular, unless something is shown to warrant a conclusion that the respondents are not treating them as regular. No formal order from the respondents appears necessary notifying that pursuant to the said order passed in OA 958/97 they have started treating the applicants regular. As and when any adverse consequences flow, attributable to the status of the applicants as temporary or ad hoc employees, then they may have cause of action to move the Tribunal for contempt. Presently and in the facts and circumstances of the case we find no case to initiate any contempt proceedings against the respondents. The application is accordingly rejected. However, the applicants are at liberty to renew the application for contempt, if there arises any occasion for moving such an application due to any act of omission or commission on the part of respondents.

Km

(K. M. Agarwal)
Chairman

R. K. Anooja

(R. K. Anooja)
Member (A)

/as/