

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP 237/2002
MA 580/2002
OA 2067/2000

New Delhi, this the 30th day of January, 2003

Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S.Tampi, Member (A)
Hon'ble Sh. Shanker Raju, Member (J)

- 1. S.K.Garg
S/o Sh. Joga Ram
SW (C)/EE(C) posted in the
office of SE (C), MH Circle
Soochna Bhawan, Lodhi Road
New Delhi.
R/o 307, Sector-19
Faridabad, Haryana.
- 2. Rajiv Kumar
S/o Sh. L.P.Garg
SW (C)/EE(C) posted in the
office of SE (C) Delhi Circle II
Soochna Bhawan, Lodhi Road
New Delhi.
R/o A-11/17
Sector - 18, Rohini, Delhi - 85.
- 3. A.K.Yadav
S/o Sh. Ram Sagar Rai
SW (C)/EE (C) posted in the
office of CE (C)-II
Soochna Bhawan, Lodhi Road
New Delhi.
R/o 61-Deluxe Apartments
Vasundhara Enclave, Delhi - 96.
- 4. Mohan Singh Mehta
S/o Sh. R.K.Mehta
SW (C)/EE(C) working in the
office of CE (C)-I, PTI Building
IInd floor, Parliament Street
New Delhi.
R/o C-1/87, Sector-31
NOIDA, UP.
- 5. Ashok Kumar
S/o Sh. Asha Ram Singh
SW (E)/EE (E) working in the office
of SE (E), Soochna Bhawan, Lodhi Road
New Delhi.
R/o 13/475, Lodhi Colony
New Delhi - 3.

..Petitioners

(By Advocate Sh. S.M.Garg)

V E R S U S

- 1. Sh. Pawan Chopra
Secretary
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Lt. General S.Nath
Secretary UPSC
Dholpur House, New Delhi - 11.

...Respondents

(By Advocate Sh. H.K.Gangwani, for respondent No.1)
Sh. Jayant Nath, for respondent No.2)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S.Tampi,

Heard Sh. S.M.Garg, counsel for the
petitioners and Sh. H.K.Gangwani, counsel for
respondent No.1, Sh. Jayant Nath, counsel for
respondent No.2.

2. On 10-1-2003, we had, in the interest of
justice, granted the respondents two weeks for
substantial compliance of the directions of the Court
in true letter and spirit, failing which, Secretary,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting was directed
to be present in the Court. Respondents point out
that the needful has been done and the required order
has been issued. Applicants are, however, not happy
as the order is made subject to the outcome of the CWP
filed in the High Court.

3. We do not find that plea made by the ld.
counsel for the petitioners is acceptable, as the
respondents have done what was expected of them in
terms of Tribunal's directions and the endorsement
with reference to the CWP was not objectionable.

4. Sh. Jayant Nath, ld. counsel for
respondent No.2 points out that last time itself it
was indicated that UPSC has already done the needful
and there was no question of their being dragged in

the contempt. But the same has not been brought on the record as the reply filed by respondent No.1 has been taken in his case also. The same may be rectified. The plea is accepted.

5. As we find that no deliberate or contumacious disobedience has been brought out on record, we dismiss CP 237/2002 as being without merit. Notices to the alleged contemnors are discharged.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

Govindan S. Tampi
(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

Gushy