

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP.No.74 of 1998  
in  
OA.No.2295 of 1997

New Delhi, this 4th day of August, 1998

HON'BLE SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER(J)  
HON'BLE SHRI K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER(A)

1. Parmeshwari  
S/o Shri Ram Dayal
2. Hira Mani Morya  
S/o Shri Suraj Deen
3. Suresh Giri  
S/o Shri Budha Giri

All residents of RZ H-308, Raj Nagar  
Palam, New Delhi-45.

... Applicants

By Advocate: Shri U. Srivastava

versus

1. Shri S.P. Mehta  
The General Manager  
Northern Railway  
Baroda House  
NEW DELHI 110001.
2. Shri K. K. Chaudhary  
Divisional Railway Manager  
Northern Railway  
State Entry Road  
NEW DELHI.
3. Shri R. K. Singh  
PWI  
MTP (R), Patel Nagar  
NEW DELHI.

... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri R. L. Dhawan

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, M(J)

Heard the learned counsel for the parties in  
this C.P. filed by the applicants alleging non  
implementation of the Tribunal's order in OA.2295/97.

8

2. Shri U. Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that contempt proceedings may be initiated against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and exemplary costs may be given.

3. The relevant portion of the order of the Tribunal 1.10.97 against which this C.P. has been filed is reproduced below:-

"The OA is disposed of with a direction to R-2 and R-3 to take a decision on the representation enclosed with the letter dated 17.6.1997 from the Office of Railway Ministry within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and communicate the decision taken to the applicant with a reasoned and speaking order."

4. Admittedly, in pursuance of the Tribunal's order dated 1.10.97, respondent-2 has passed a speaking order dated 16.3.98. Shri U. Srivastava, learned counsel submits that in the last paragraph of the letter dated 16.3.98 since the respondents have stated that "in case you still feel aggrieved by this decision, you can represent your case to this office only if you have any further cause to state so" and he has made a further representation, we may direct the respondents to dispose of that representation also in the Contempt Petition.

5. We have considered the pleadings and submissions. It is settled law (see J.S. Parihar Vs Duggar J.T. (1996) 9 S.C.608) that in a Contempt Petition no further directions can be given.

8/5

9

6. At this stage, Shri U. Srivastava, learned counsel seeks permission to withdraw this C.P. Permission to withdraw the C.P. is granted. C.P.74/98 is accordingly dismissed. Notices issued to respondents are discharged.

(K. Muthukumar)  
Member (A)

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)

dbc