

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

C.P.NO.566/2001
IN
O.A.NO. ~~2001/2001~~
712/2000

(25)

Thursday, this the 27th day of September, 2001

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (Admn)

Brij Kishore, S/O Sh. Sumer
R/O Quarter No.9/1, Daya Basti
Northern Railway,
Delhi

..Petitioner

(By Advocate: Shri M.K.Bhardwaj)

Versus

Union of India through

1. Shri Ravinder Nath,
General Manager, Northern Railway
Baroda House,
New Delhi
2. Shri Aditya Prakash Mishar
Divisional Railway Manager
DRM Office (Northern Railway)
New Delhi
3. Shri S.S.Rana
Divisional Superintendent Engineer (Estate)
Northern Railway, DRM Office
New Delhi

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, M (A):-

Non-compliance of orders passed by this Tribunal on 10.7.2001 in OA-712/2000 forms the basis of this Contempt Petition. By the aforesaid order, the respondents were directed to consider the allotment of a suitable quarter to the petitioner as per his entitlement within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has placed before us a copy of the order dated

(2)

26

7.9.2001 passed by the respondent-authority by which quarter No.23/8, Daya Basti has been allotted to him in compliance of the aforesaid order. According to the learned counsel, the aforesaid quarter belongs to Type-I, whereas the petitioner is entitled to Type-II quarter. In view of this, the learned counsel argues that the compliance made is not wholly in accordance with the directions given. We do not agree. All that the Tribunal had directed the respondents ^{to do} was to consider the ~~allotment~~ allotment of a quarter to the petitioner as per his entitlement. No direction was given to make allotment of a quarter as per the applicant's entitlement. We note that the respondents have proceeded to ensure ^{order in the best possible manner} compliance of this Tribunal's within the time given to them for this purpose, and accordingly no case of wilful disobedience is made out.

3. In the circumstances, we do not find any ground for proceeding with the present Contempt Petition any further. The Contempt Petition is dismissed. MA-2147/2001 stands disposed of.

S.A.T. Rizvi

(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman (J)

/sunny/