

13

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. NO. 367/1997
in
O.A. NO. 1081/1997

New Delhi, this the 22nd December, 1997.

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

HON'BLE SHRI N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)

Rajesh Kumar Maurya
S/O M. L. Mauriya,
R/O B-58/1, Shashi Garden,
Gali No.9 (Near Mayur Vihar Phase-I),
Delhi-110091. ... Applicant

(By Shri Surinder Singh, Advocate)

-Versus-

Shri N. P. Singh,
Secretary,
Department of Urban Development,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-110011. ... Respondent

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice K. M. Agarwal :-

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant. This is a contempt application for non-compliance with the common order dated 1.8.1997 passed in O.A. Nos. 1081/97, 1083/97, 1084/97 and 1085/97. The direction made in the O.A.s is as follows :-

"6. In the circumstances, the respondents shall finalise the policy decision as to what would be the percentage of reservation, as quick as possible before filling up all the vacancies now advertised so that the portion of the vacancies now advertised in accordance with their policy shall be available for the apprentice trainees who have successfully completed their training."

There is no specific time limit fixed for compliance with the aforesaid direction of the Bench. However, the learned counsel drew our attention to paragraph 5 of the order where it is stated that according to the counsel for the respondents, they would at least

take another three months' time for finalising the policy from the date of the order. Accordingly, it was urged that the Bench gave three months' time for compliance. We do not agree. The operative part of the order says that the respondents shall finalise the policy decision 'as quick as possible'. That does not mean a period of three months or any other duration of time. As per paragraph 2 of the Government of India's order dated 14.8.1987 at page 60 of the Swamy's Compilation on Central Administrative Tribunal, the orders of the Tribunal are required to be implemented within a period of six months from the date of receipt of the order in cases where time limit is not prescribed by the Tribunal.

2. Under these circumstances, we are of the view that this application is premature and accordingly it is hereby dismissed as premature with liberty to the applicant to renew it after expiry of a period of six months from the date of receipt of the said order dated 1.8.1997 by the respondents.

KM

(K. M. Agarwal)
Chairman

N. Sahu

(N. Sahu)
Member (A)

/as/