

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

20

C.C.P. No.268/95

in

O.A.No.1949/93

New Delhi, this the 1st day of July 1996.

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Member(A)

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

Dr. Shri Ram

s/o late Shri Ram Rakh,  
r/o 60-Sangam Apartments,  
Opp: Ambika Vihar,  
Paschim Vihar,  
New Delhi.

.... Applicant

By Advocate: Shri V.K. Jain

Vs.

1. Shri G.S. Sahni,  
Secretary,  
ICAR, Krishni Bhawan,  
New Delhi.

2. Shri J.K. Nath,  
Under Secretary(P),  
ICAR, Krishi Bhawan,  
New Delhi.

... Respondents

By Advocate: Shri R.S. Aggarwal

O R D E R

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

We have heard Shri V.K. Jain, learned counsel for the petitioner and Shri R.S. Aggarwal, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the record.

2. In pursuance of the judgement of this Tribunal dated 19.5.95 the respondents have passed the order

dated 4.8.95 which gives the reasons why they are unable to count the applicant's service in the Govt. of Bihar for pension purposes in ICAR. The submissions made by Shri V.K.Jain, learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondents have not complied with the judgement dated 19.5.95 is, therefore, rejected as we find no wilful or contemptuous disobedience of the Tribunal's order. In view thereof, the notice on C.P. is discharged.

3. During the course of arguments the learned counsel for respondents submitted that they had made all efforts to contact their counter part, namely, the Scientist-in-Charge, Central Potato Research Station, Patna to follow up the matter with the Govt. of Bihar to get the amount of pensionary liability discharged by that Govt. for the services rendered by the petitioner while he was in service with them. However, no reply has yet been received from the State Government. He, however, fairly stated that the ICAR would be able to take up the matter again through the Ministry of Agriculture with the State Government to get the necessary orders/pensionary benefits from them, if possible. We note this assurance given by the respondents that they would pursue the

22

matter with the State Govt. immediately so that they will be able to give the necessary relief to the applicant in accordance with the rules.

4. C.P. is dismissed.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*  
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)

Member (J)

*S.R. Adige*  
(S.R. Adige)

Member (A)

/rk/