

(19)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

C.P. No. 264/98 In
O.A. No. 727/97

New Delhi this the 26th day of October 1999

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy, VC (J)
Hon'ble Mrs. Shanta Shastri, Member (A)

Dr. N.C. Singhal
S/o Late Shri Lekh Ram,
C-115, Greater Kailash-I,
New Delhi-110048.

.....Petitioner

(Applicant in person)

Versus

Shri Ajit Kumar,
Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
South Block,
New Delhi-110001.

....Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri S.M. Arif)

ORDER (Oral)

By Reddy, J.-

Heard the petitioner in person and counsel
for respondents.

1. The C.P. is filed complaining that the directions given by the Tribunal in OA-727/97 dated 5.9.97 were not complied with. While disposing of the OA the Tribunal directed the respondents to calculate the interest in the light of the letter of the CDA, Annexure A1, dated 27.1.1996 and to pay the same to the applicant within a period of three months. In the reply it was stated that respondents had paid an amount of Rs. 94,559/- to the applicant vide letter dated 27.3.98. The interest on delayed payment of interest as decided by the Tribunal has also been worked out for the period from 27.3.96 to

CA

27.3.98 i.e. date of release of payment of interest amounting to Rs. 94,559/-. The period involved is 25 months and interest on delayed payment of interest works out to Rs. 35,460/-. The said amount has also been paid to the applicant.

3. The petitioner, in person, contends that he is entitled to Rs. 1,36,000/- towards interest on delayed payment. Out of which only 35,460/- was paid. It was however averred in the counter affidavit that the petitioner had filed another OA-1912/98 for prosecution of the order of the present OA, questioning the inadequate payment of interest by the respondents. It is also stated that the said OA has also been heard and judgment is awaited.

4. In this C.P. we cannot go into the question as to what the correct amount of interest or other details as to the period. As directed by the Tribunal the respondents had considered the case of the petitioner and paid the interest and according to them it was correct. Now that another OA has been filed by the petitioner for implementation of the order of the Tribunal the above questions could be decided. We do not however find any deliberate violation of the order.

5. C.P. is, therefore, closed. Notice issued to the alleged contemner is discharged.

h. a. s. f.

(Mrs. Shanta Shastry)
Member(A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
Vice-Chairman (J)