## CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

UP 563/2001 DA 1551/2000



New Delhi this the 30 th day of September, 2003

Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Shri V.K.Majotra, Member (A)

- Anil Kumar S/O Sh. Vijay Pal Singh H.No. 2110/1E Prem Nagar, Gali No. 10, New Delhi-8
- Bijender Kumar S/O Sh. Dukhit Mehto, RZB 309/1, Nihar Vihar, Nangloi, New Delhi -41
- 3. Vijay Singh S/O Sh. Rajender Prasad Singh, 2117/A Prem Nagar, West Patel Nagar, New Delhi – 110 064
- 4. Bhupender Singh S/O Shri Om Prakash, T 677, BN/6A Ranjit Nagar, New Delhi-6
- 5. Vijay Kumar Singh S/O Shri Anup Singh. T 677. BN/6A Ranjit Nagar, New Delhi-6
- 6. Vinod Kumar Singh S/O Shri Anup Singh. T 677, BN/6A Ranjit Nagar, New Delhi-6

8.

7. Sanjay Kumar S/O Shri Mani Ram, H. No. 2109/1, Prem Nagar, Gali No.10, New Delhi-6



- 8. Bharat Bhushan S/O Shri Mani Ram, H. No. 2109/1, Prem Nagar, Gali No.10, New Delhi-6
- 9. Kumar Gaurav S/O Shri Vijay Pal Singh, H. No. 2110/1E, Prem Nagar Gali No. 9, New Delhi-8
- 10 Devender Singh S/O Shri Jay Karan,H3 DMS Colony, Near Shadi Pur Depot,New Delhi-8
- 11 Manvir Singh S/O Shri Amar Singh, T 510 F 24C/4, Baljit Nagar, New Delhi-8
- 12. Anil Kumar S/O Shri Kirpal Singh, 29/407, DMS Colony, Hari Nagar, Ghanta Ghar, New Delhi-64
- 13. Lokesh Chand S/O Shri Hukam Chand, D 624, Baljit Nagar, New Delhi-8
- 14. Ombir Singh S/O Shri Asha Ram Singh, T510, F 240/4, Baljit Nagar, N. Delhi-8
- 15 Sampal Singh S/O Jay Karan Singh, H3, DMS Colony, Near Shadi Pur Depot, New Delhi-8
- 16.Santar Pal Singh S/O Shri Rohtas Singh, T 510, F24C/4, Baljit Nagar, N.Delhi-8
- 17. Satya Parkash Singh S/O Shri Amar Nath Singh, E 6/12, Sultanpuri, Delhi-41



- 18.Rakesh Kumar S/O Sh. Ram Naresh Dubey, T-605, Baljit Nagar, Prem Nagar Road, Vijay Park, Near Shadhi Pur Depot, New Delhi-8
- 19 Manoj Kumar S/O Sh. Ram Kumar, D 625, Baljit Nagar, N.Delhi-8
- 20 Naresh Kumar S/O Shri Sansar Chand, H-33, DMS Colony, Near Shadipur Depot, N.Delhi-8
- 21 Shashi Kant S/O Sh. Shiv Govind T 7831, AR1, Baljit Nagar, Gali No. 8, New Delhi-8
- 22. Dalip Kumar S/O Shri Jai Kishan Mahto, 139/200, Sector 5, Rohini, Delhi-85
- 23 Ajay Kumar S/O Sh. Chhotendra Prasad Singh, Sector 4, 573, Timarpur, Near Balak Ram Hospital, Delhi-54
- 24. Vinod Kumar, Yadav S/O Shri Ram Samuth Yadav, T 452, Baljit Nagar, Gali No. 21, Nav Durga Mohalla, N.Delhi-8
- 25 Vinod Kumar S/O Sh. Ram Bharat Yadav, S/O Vijay Singh, 16/227, DMS Colony, Hari Nagar, Ghantagarh N.Delhi-64
- 26. Naresh Kumar S/O Shri Mangat Ram, Vill Gokul Pur Loni Mor, In Front of Authority
- 27. Neeraj Kumar S/O Sh. Khagesh Mahto, 24/334, DMS Colony, Hari Nagar, Ganta Ghar, New Delhi-64
- 28. Jitender Kumar S/O Sh. Shyam Lal, Pocket G, Block No. 29, Sector III, House No. 221, Rohini, Delhi-85

- A. Ravinder Kumar S/O Sh.Jagpal Singh H.No.2099/A,Prem Nagar,Gali No.15, New Delhi.
- Pritam Kumar S/O Jagdish Chand,
   2/32/A19, Prem Nagar, Gali No.3,
   New Delhi.
- 31. Dev Dutt Sharma S/O Sh.Pehlad Singh, C/O Vijay Singh 16/227, DMS Colony, Hari Nagar, Ghanta Ghar, New Delhi-6
- 32. Anil Kumar S/O Shri Jagdish Choudhay, 12/167, DMS Colony, Hari Nagar, Ghanta Ghar, New Delhi-64
- 33. Jagdish Kumar S/O Shri Ram Chander Pandey, J 2470/A 1, Gali No. 21, Baljit Naga, New Delhi-8
- 34. Rajender Singh, S/O ShriRambir Singh, T 510, F 24 C/4, Baljit Nagar, New Delhi-110006

..Petitioners

(By Advocate Shri S.M.Garg, learned counsel through proxy counsel Ms Manju Aggarwal)

## **VERSUS**

- Shri D.K.Biswas, Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, (Deptt.of Animal Husbandry and Dairy), Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.
- 2. Shri R.M.Misra,
   General Manager,
   Delhi Milk Scheme, West Patel Nagar,
   New Delhi.

..Respondents

(By Advocate Shri N.S.Mehta, learned senior counsel with Shri Rajinder Nischal, learned counsel through proxy counsel Shri Asish Nischal)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Honble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)

Learned proxy counsel for the petitioners seeks an adjournment on the ground that counsel is unwell and he



15

wishes to be heard. It is settled law the that petitioners who have brought out certain facts the Contempt Petition (CP) on which notices have been issued to the respondents, may assist the Court but essentially Contempt Petition and the is between the Court alleged contemners. Having regard to several pronouncements of the Hon'ble Apex Court in this regard we have, therefore, considered it proper to hear the learned senior counsel for the respondents. We have also perused the relevant documents, including the Contempt Petition filed by the petitioners alleging wilful and contumacious disobedience of the Tribunal's order dated 22,12,2000.

- 2. In Tribunal's aforesaid order in OA 1551/2000, the following direction was given in Para 13(1):-
  - "(1) The respondents while counting the period of actual working days of the applicants (Badli Workers) shall also add the number of offs and three National holidays in the weeklv actual working days οf applicants, if not already counted and out റെ those workers who are found to have completed 240 days then in accordance with the provision of Para 4(iii) of the Standing Orders, the said Badli workers shall be regular establishment", transfered
- 3. Admittedly, the above order has been upheld by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Learned senior counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents have passed Annexures AAIII dated 15.1.2003 and 25.8.2003, in compliance with the directions of the aforesaid order of the Tribunal. We note that detail annexures have been given by the respondents giving

B



the calculations of computation of 240 days for the year 1999-2000 in respect of each of the applicants, in terms of the Tribunal's directions. They have also given the statement of the national Holidays and weekly offs during the 12 months in question.

- The Tribunal had directed the respondents to count the period of actual working days of the applicants (Badli workers), including the weekly offs and three national holidays, if not already counted, to ascertain whether they have completed 240 days as required under the Standing Order. On perusal of the aforesaid documents to the compliance affidavit filed by annexed the respondents dated 27.8.2003, we are satisfied that the respondents have done the necessary exercise as directed and find that the applicants have not completed the required 240 days of service. If the applicants have any further grievance as to the manner in which the calculation has been done, as submitted by the learned counsel for the respondents, that is a differrent matter. In the circumstances of the case, it cannot be held that the respondents have committed wilful and contumacious disobedience of the Tribunal's order warranting further action being taken against them for punishment under Section 17 of the Administative Tribunals Act, 1985 with the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.
- 5. In this view of the matter, CP 563/2001 is dismissed. Notices issued to the alleged contemners are

18,

区

(39)

discharged. File be consigned to the record room. However, in the circumstances of the case, liberty is granted to the applicant as advised.

( V.K.Majotra ) Member (A)

( Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan) Vice Chairman (J)

şk

7