

Central Administrative Tribunal

Principal Bench  
New Delhi

C.P. No.315/97  
in  
O.A. No.242/96



This the 20th day of November, 1997.

Hon'ble Dr. Jose P. Verghese, Vice Chairman(J)

Hon'ble Shri N. Sahu, Member(Admnv)

1. Dr. Sadhna Mate  
D/o Late Mr. S. D. Chakradeo,  
R/o 13-F, K-Block, Saket,  
New Delhi.

2. Dr. Anuradha Bali,  
D/o Shri S. K. Sharma,  
R/o 96-B, Pocket-I,  
Phase-I, Mayur Vihar,  
New Delhi.

3. Dr. Meera Chaudhary,  
D/o Sh. R. C. P. Chaudhary,  
R/o D-164, Saket,  
New Delhi-110017.

(By Advocate Shri Manoj Goyal)

..... Applicants

Versus

1. Shri Ramesh Chandra  
Secretary(Medical)  
Dept. of Health & Family Welfare,  
Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi  
Old Rajpur Road,  
Delhi

2. Shri P. P. Chauhan  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare,  
Govt. of India,  
Nirman Bhavan,  
New Delhi.

3. Shri B. K. Dhaon  
Dean,  
Maulana Azad Medical College,  
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg,  
New Delhi

.... Respondents.

(By Advocates Sh. Vijay Pandita for  
R-1 & 3. Mrs. Raj Kumari Chopra for  
R-2)

ORDER (Oral)

By Hon'ble Dr. Jose P. Verghese, VC(J).

The petitioner is aggrieved by non-implementation

16

of our order dated 29.11.96. Respondent Nos.1 and 3 have filed an affidavit stating that the respondent No.2 has not agreed to implement the order of this court. In the circumstances an additional notice was directed to be issued to respondent No.2 to explain the circumstances in which the said stand was taken by respondent No.2.

2. Matter came up today and it was clarified that such statement of the respondent No.2 was not correct and as such no further affidavit is required of respondent No.2.

3. With regard to the implementation of our order dated 29.11.96, the learned counsel for respondents Nos.1 and 3 submits that they may be given some time to implement the same and they will do the same within 6 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In case any concurrence for the same is required from the respondent No.2 the same will be given within the said period. On the basis of the undertaking given today, we do not propose to retain the C.P. any more. The learned counsel for the respondents Nos. 1 and 3 submitted that an S.L.P. has been filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court. We do not think it is the reason for non-implementation of our orders. With this view, the C.P. is disposed of. Notices discharged.

*Ganesan*  
(N. SAHU)  
M(A)

*JV*  
(DR. JOSE P. VERGHESE)  
VC(J)

RB