

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP.No.261 of 1997  
in  
OA.No.1778 of 1997

32

New Delhi, this 19th day of September, 1997.

HON'BLE DR JOSE P. VERGHESE, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)  
HON'BLE MR K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER(A)

1. U. C. Upreti  
Scientist 'C'  
National Physical Laboratory  
NEW DELHI-12
2. Dr K. K. Saini  
Scientist 'C'  
National Physical Laboratory  
NEW DELHI-12
3. Dr (Mrs) Kiran Jain  
Scientist 'C'  
National Physical Laboratory  
NEW DELHI-12
4. Dr T. K. Saxena  
Scientist 'C'  
National Physical Laboratory  
NEW DELHI-12 ...Petitioners

By Advocate: Shri A. K. Sharma

versus

1. Shri V. S. Ramamurthy  
Secretary  
Ministry of Science and Technology  
NEW DELHI.
2. Dr R. A. Mashelkar  
Director General  
CSIR Headquarters  
NEW DELHI.
3. Dr E. S. R. Gopal  
Director  
National Physical Laboratory  
Dr K. S. Krishna Road  
NEW DELHI-110012.
4. Mr B. S. Gera  
Deputy Secretary  
CSIR Headquarters  
NEW DELHI.

5. Shri H. R. Gupta  
The Controller of Administration  
National Physical Laboratory  
Dr K. S. Krishnan Road  
NEW DELHI-110012.

... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri V. K. Rao

33

O R D E R (ORAL)


DR JOSE P. VERGHESE, VC(J)


This CP is filed by the petitioners complaining that the respondents have not complied with the undertaking given to this court on 21.8.97. We have seen the order passed by us on 21.8.97. The undertaking given to us was only to file reply within two weeks and we had also stated that let the same be filed without any further delay. Thereafter the matter was wrongly listed on 2.9.97 and again on 15.9.97, and we have permitted the respondents to file reply. Today the matter is on board and this CP is also listed as sl.no.4 of miscellaneous item. The counsel for the respondents present in the court states that the reply is being filed today and it could not be served on the petitioners. In the circumstances, we do not intend to issue notice on this.

It was stated by the counsel for the petitioners that even though it is said that he could not contact the petitioners to serve a copy of the reply, nobody had contacted him to the best of his knowledge. In any event, we would like to finish up this matter with the observation that the contempt of court jurisdiction should be exercised very sparingly and only in a matter where wilful violation of

the orders of the court are reflected by the  
conduct of the respondents against our orders.  
We are of the opinion that no notice is required  
in this CP and in view of the observations made  
above, we dispose of the C.P. without issuing  
notice

34

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

  
(DR JOSE P. VERGHESE)  
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

dbc