CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

## C.P.No. 317/99

IN

0 A No 170 6/ 97

New Delhi: this the A day of AVAUST \$20007 HON'BLE MR.S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

HON BLE MR . KUEDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

Shri Khamman Singh, Soo Shri Govind Ram,

Village Sameri, Post Chhata, Distt Mathura (UP),

Applicanta

( By Advocate: Shri Dinsharma)

## Versus

Lt. General Shri S.C. Verma; Director General of Medical Services; AMC.

Amy Headquarters
Sena Bhawan,
DHQ, Post Office,
New Delhi
(By Adv. Shri P.K. Gupta)

777. Contemner -Respondents

MrssRAdige,VC(A).

A?

Heard both sides on C.P.No.317/99

The Tribunal's directions dated 2512597
in OA No.706/97 to respondents were to consider
applicant's representation dated 10.2597 on merits and
if applicant was eligible to appear for a 2nd medical
example, he was to be directed to appear in the 2nd
medical example either by a Civil Surgeon or any other
specialist as per rules and communicate the result
of such medical example or other wise dispose of
applicant's representation within 3 months.

From respondents reply to the C.P. it is clear that applicant was medically examined by Lt.Col.Kuldeep Singh who found him unfit for appointment. Not being satisfied with that

(22)

examination, he filed an appeal upon which he was examined by Col-A.D.Mathur who also found applicant medically unfit; Still not satisfied, applicant again represented, upon which he was medically examined yet again by Lt.Col-Wadhera, but was again found unfit;

We have no reasons to disbelieve respondents reply; and under the circumstances, there are no materials to warrant initiation of contempt proceedings against respondents.

If applicant is aggrieved by the findings in the medical examination, it is open to him to challenge the same seperately in accordance with law, if so advised.

Subject to what has been stated in para 5 above the C.P. is dismissed. Notices discharged.

( KULDIP SINGH )

MEMBER (J)

Infolg.
(s.R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN(A)

/ug/

1