

16

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

C.P.No.38/2002 in
O.A.No.2137/2000

Hon'ble Shri V.K.Majotra, Member(A)
Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member(J)

Friday, this the 10th day of May, 2002

1. Shri Tikam Singh
s/o Shri Uday Partap Singh
2. Shri Vinod Kumar
s/o Shri Suraj Bhan
3. Shri Parvinder Kumar
s/o Shri Gurbalass
4. Shri Sunil Kumar
s/o Shri Parkash Bidla

All the above four applicants are
Ex. Casual labourers
under Director (PCP)
Central Water Commission
Sewa Bhawan, R.K.Puram
New Delhi.
(By Advocate: Sh. B.S.Mainee)

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. Shri Suresh Chandra
Chairman
Central Water Commission
Sewa Bhawan, R.K.Puram
New Delhi.
2. Shri K.S.Jacob
Director
PCP Directorate
Central Water Commission
R.K.Puram
New Delhi.
(By Advocate: Shri B.S.Jain)


.. Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

By V.K.Majotra, M(A):
Heard both the counsel.

2. Learned counsel of applicants, Shri B.S.Mainee stated that vide order dated 8.6.2001 in OA No.2137/2000 was disposed of with the following directions to the respondents:

"Under these circumstances, I feel that this OA deserves to be allowed. Accordingly I allow this O.A. and quash the oral order of termination with a



direction to respondents to re-engage the applicants in preference to juniors and freshers. However, the applicants shall not be paid salary for the period they have not performed the duty. Applicants shall be re-engaged within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs."

3. Shri B.S.Maine, learned counsel stated that whereas directions of this Court should have been complied by the respondents before 8.8.2001, they have re-engaged the applicants w.e.f. 18.12.2001. The related order has been enclosed by the respondents with their reply affidavit.

4. Clearly there has been a delay of more than four months in implementing the directions of this Court.

5. Shri B.S.Jain, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents stated that the delay has been caused as the respondents had to consult Ministry of Water Resources, DoPT and Legal Affairs, which process has taken so much time.

6. We find that the respondents did not resort to any application for extension of time for implementing the directions of this Court. Although respondents have tendered their unconditional apology, we are not satisfied with the callous attitude of the respondents in causing so much of delay in implementing the directions of this Court. In this behalf, we deprecate the conduct of the respondents.

7. With the above observations, the CP is disposed of and notices issued against the respondents are discharged.

Wb

8. Learned counsel for applicants verbally submitted, at the Bar, that as the delay in implementing of the directions of this Court is attributable to the respondents alone, the applicants should have been adequately compensated by way of payment of wages for the delayed period. This prayer cannot be considered in contempt proceedings. Applicants shall have liberty to seek redressal in this behalf separately as per law.

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju)
Member(J)

V.K. Majotra

(V.K. Majotra)
Member(A)

/rao/