

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P.No.327/2000 in
M.A.No.2108/2000
O.A.No.242/96

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 7th day of November, 2000

1. Dr. Sadhana Mate
d/o Late Mr. S.D.Chakradeo
r/o 13-F, K-Block, Saket
New Delhi.
2. Dr. Anuradha Bali
d/o S.K.Sharma
r/o 96-B Pocket-I
Phase-I, Mayur Vihar
New Delhi.
3. Dr. Meera Choudhary
d/o Shri R.C.P.Chaudhary
r/o D-164 Saket
New Delhi - 110 017. Petitioners

(By Shri Manoj Goel, through Shri S.Roy, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Shri Chander Mohan
Secretary (Medical)
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Old Rajpur Road
Delhi.
2. Shri J.A.Chaudhary
Secretary
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
Govt. of India
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi.
3. Dinesh Chandra
Dean
Maulana Azad Medical College
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi. Contemnors/Respondents

(By Shri Ajesh Luthra, Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy:

Heard the counsel for the petitioners and the respondents. The direction given in the order dated 29.11.1996, which is now complained of is as under:

CL

- 2 -

(22)

"Applicants have also sought a direction to grant them similar promotional avenues as Demonstrators (Medical). This is a matter which has to be considered by respondents. They will do so, pass a speaking order and communicate the same to applicants."

2. It is now stated in the order dated 23.6.1999/24.10.2000 that as per the directions given by the Tribunal the representation has been considered but rejected. The learned counsel for the petitioner however contends that the applicants are also entitled for the benefit of promotional avenues as ~~was~~ given to ^{as} ~~are~~ the Demonstrators (Medical) ~~who are both~~ ^{as} Graduates. But the respondents had not granted the benefits and ~~order~~ ^{order} the ~~consideration~~ is ~~fully~~ illegal. But we are afraid that in this Contempt Petition our jurisdiction being very limited, we cannot go into the validity of the order of the respondents, since a direction was issued only to consider and dispose of the representation of the petitioners, if the petitioners are aggrieved by these proceedings, it is open to them to question the same in a separate OA.

3. ~~But~~ The CP also appears to be barred by limitation as the order in earlier CP No.515/97 passed in November, 1997 whereas the present CP is filed in August, 2000. The CP is therefore dismissed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged. No costs.

(GOVINDAN S. TAMPI)
MEMBER(A)

Ambygulam
(V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/RAO/