## CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP No.60/2002 in OA No.1154/2000

New Delhi, this 7th day of February, 2002

Honble Shri Justice Ashok Agarwal, Chairman Honble Shri M.P.Singh, Member(A)

Dalel Singh Village Baaprolla, Tehsil Najafgarh New Delhi

Petitioner

(By Shri Keshav Kaushik, Advocate)

versus

Shi C.S. Rao
Secretary, Deptt. of Expenditure
M/Finance, New Delhi
Shri Kamal Pandey

 Shri Kamal Pandey Secretary(Home) M/Home Affairs, New Delhi

3. Shri Kamal Kumar Director, NCRB East Block 7, R.K.Puram New Delhi

Respondents

ORDER(oral)

By Shri Justice Ashok Agarwal

Non-compliance of the orders passed on 7.2.2001 in OA No.1154/2000 is made the basis of the present contempt petition. The following directions were given in the aforesaid OA:

"9. For all the reasons given above, the OA is allowed with direction to the respondents to fix the pay of the applicant in the pay scale applicable to DEO(A) w.e.f. 23.11.92 in such a manner that together with the personal pay of Rs.330/-, the applicant gets a total pay of 23.11.92. The respondents Rs.1480/- w.e.f. are further directed to absorb the aforesaid personal pay of Rs.330/- in future increases of his pay. The applicant will no doubt be his pay. The applicant will no doubt be entitled to all the consequential benefits arising from the aforesaid directions. directed to ensure are also respondents compliance of the above directions in a maximum period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(A)

2. In the present contempt petition, it is not the grievance of the petitioner that he has not been given the pay of DEO(A) from 23.11.92 as directed. His grievance is that he has not been given the pay of Rs.5000-8000, which, according to him is his entitlement as per the recommendations of the 5th Pay Commission. The aforesaid claim for the grant of the aforeosaid scale in terms of 5th Pay Commission was not the subject matter of the aforesaid directions contained in the aforesaid OA. No action in the present contempt petition, in the circumstances, is called for. The same is accordingly rejected in limine.

(M.P. Singh) Member(A) Ashok Agarwal) Chajrman

/gtv/