

FORM NO. 2
[See rule 11]
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

CP-71/12

Dialy No. 13540

CP (Civil/Criminal)

in OA / PA

1684/2000

Between Sh. Man. Chet. Petitioner(s)

By Mr. Meenu Maheer & R.S. Maheer
{Name of the Counsel, if any}

And Mr. S. Balle Koti Respondent(s)

By
{Name of the counsel, if any}

Subject

{No } Deptt.

{No}

REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY OF CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL/CRIMINAL)

1. Whether the name (including as far as possible the name of father/mother/husband, age, occupation and address of the petitioner(s) and the respondent(s) are given? Yes

NOTE: Where the respondent is an officer, his name Designation and office address above are enough.

2. Whether the parties impleaded as a petitioner(s) & Respondent(s) are proper? Yes

Note: (a) In case of Civil Contempt for disobeying the order of the Tribunal, it is the party in whose favour the direction is issued that can be made impleaded as petitioner and the party against whom the direction is impleaded as respondent.

(b) In case of criminal contempt, the party who is alleged to have committed contempt, that can be impleaded as respondent.

3. Nature of the contempt (Civil / Criminal) and the provisions of the Act invoked? Yes

21st Dec 2011

4.

- (a) Date of alleged Contempt Petition?
- (b) Date of filing of the contempt petition?

© Whether the petition is barred by the limitation under section 20 of the contempt of courts Act 1971?

No

5.

- (a) Whether the grounds and material facts constituting the alleged contempt are given?

- (b) Whether the grounds and facts alleged in the petition are divided into paragraphed and numbered?

- © Whether the petition is accompanied by supporting documents or certified Photostat(attached) copies of the original thereof?

- (d) If the petitioner relies upon any other document(s) in his possession, whether copy of such documents is/ are filed along with the petition?

Yes

- (e) Whether the petition and its annexure have been filed in a paper book form and duly indexed and paginated?

- (f) Whether three complete sets of the Paper Book have been filed in case there are more respondents than one?

- (g) Whether equal number of extra copies of paper book has been filed in case there are more respondents than one?

6.

Whether the nature of the order sought from the Tribunal is stated?

7.

Whether the petition is supported by an affidavit sworn to by the petitioner verifying the facts relied upon?

Yes

Yes

Note: No affidavit is required if the motion is by Attorney General/Solicitor General/Additional Solicitor General.

8.

Whether the petitioner and his Advocate have signed the petition indicating the place and date?

Yes

A. The proposed contempt petition arises out of and order

dated 12-12-2001 passed by a Bench consisting of

Hon'ble Mr. Govindan S. Pappu, M.L.A. and

Hon'ble Mr. Shanker Reddy, M.L.A.

The petitioner(s) contention is that the aforesaid order of the Tribunal has not been complied with and the respondent(s) has/have committed contempt. The paper are in order. May list the CP before the Bench for preliminary hearing Under Rules 7(i) of the C.A.T. (Contempt of Courts Rules 1992).

B. The Contempt Petitioner(s) (Civil / Criminal) is/are delinquent in respect of Item No. _____ and

(a) Petition has not been filed as durable white foolscap folio paper of Metric A-4 size (30.5 cm long & 21.5 cm wide) with a left margin of 5 cm and right margin of 2.5 cm. (bass) Please also ensure that the parties arrayed in the CP should be made as parties in CA.

If approved we may notify the Contempt Petition under objection at a rectify within seven days.

DEALING ASSISTANT

SECTION OFFICER

DEPUTY REGISTRAR (C.D.L.)

30/1/12
may be listed in C-II as per Rules on 1/2/12 since both the members demitted office.

31/1/12

[Signature]
31.1.12

9. In case of Civil Contempt whether the petition is
Accompanied by a certified copy of the judgment/degree/
Order/writ/undertaking alleged to have been disobeying
by the alleged contemnor?

Yes

10. (a) In case of criminal contempt not covered by Section 14
of the Contempt of Courts Act. Whether the petitioner has
produced the Consent obtained from the Attorney General/
Solicitor General/Additional Solicitor General?

NA

(b) If not, whether the petition contains the reasons there of?
(Contempt committed in the presence of hearing of the Member(s))

11. Whether the petitioner has previously
made a contempt petition on the same
facts? If so, have the following been
furnished:

No

(a) Number of the petition?

(b) Whether the petition is pending and

© If disposed of nature/result of the disposal with date?

Yes

12. Whether the draft charges are enclosed in a separate sheet?

FOR DIRECTION: Orders on the administrative side have to be obtained from the
Chairman/Vice Chairman or Member designated in case of action for criminal Contempt, as
required by Rule 7(ii) before placing for preliminary hearing.

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI

CP 71 / 2011 ✓
IN

O.A.NO 1684/2000

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Mam Chand

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Of India & Ors

...Respondents

Index

S.No.	Particulars	Page No
1.	Memo of Parties	A
2.	Contempt Petition [C] u/s 11 Of Contempt of Court Act, 1971 read with Section 17 of Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 together with supporting affidavit & Draft Charges	1 — 8A
3.	<u>Annexure CP-1</u> Copy of the Judgment dated 12.12.2001	9 - 21
4.	<u>Annexure CP-2</u> A copy of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 10.8.2010,	22 - 25
5.	<u>Annexure CP-3</u> A copy of Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 18.3.2011.	26
6.	<u>Annexure CP-4</u> Copy of the Hon'ble Tribunal Order dated 18.11.2011	27

Place: New Delhi

Date: <u>12/12/11</u> Today 21 DEC 2011 दाखिल नं०/एम.ए.टी. (प.ब.) <u>13540</u> उप सचिव, ए.ए.टी. (प.ब.)

Through

Petitioner

[Meenu Mainee & B.S. Mainee]
Advocates
2-A-33,34, GC Grand, Vaibhav Khand
Indirapuram, Ghaziabad

(A)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI

CP _____/2011
IN
O.A.NO 1684/2000

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Mam Chand

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Of India & Ors

...Respondents

MEMO OF PARTIES

S/Shri

✓ 1. Mam Chand

S/o Soran Singh, SOM

Suboverseer Mistry (Work Mistry)

Under Chief Administrative Officer (Const.)

Northern Railway

Kashmere Gate, Delhi

2. Dharam Vir

S/o Sh. Chet Ram

Under Dy. C.E./C

SOM, Northern Railway

Patel Nagar, New Delhi

3. Amarjit Singh

S/o Inder Singh

SOM

Under SEN/C

Northern Railway, Ludhiana

✓ 4. Ravi Lal

S/o Kalu Ram

SOM

Under Dy. CE/C

Northern Railway, Chandigarh

5. Rajinder Kumar

S/o Sadhu Ram

SOM

Under Dy. CE/C



①

Northern Railway, Chandigarh

6. Roshan Lal
S/o Ganpat Ram
SOM
Under Dy. CE/C
Northern Railway, CSB

..... Petitioners

VERSUS

1. Sh. S. Budla Koti
General Manager
Northern Railway
Baroda House
New Delhi.

2. Dinesh Kumar
Chief Administrative Officer (Const.)
Northern Railway
Kashmere Gate
Delhi

.... Respondents

CONTEMPT PETITION [C] U/S 11 OF CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT,
1971 READ WITH SECTION 17 OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ACT, 1985

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. That the petitioners had filed the above noted O.A. praying for directions to Respondents to fix their salary in grade 1400-2300 extending benefit of their earlier work as temporary status holders in the category of Suboverseer Mistry (SOM) w.e.f. 1.1.1986 and the category of SPM was placed in the same grade along with fixation of their pay with all consequential benefit.
 2. That the aforesaid O.A. was allowed by this Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 12.12.2001 in terms of which
- /

the Hon'ble Tribunal had been pleased to allow the OA with directions to the Respondents to accord them benefit of revised pay scale 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.1986 notionally and actual from the date of filing of this O.A. i.e. w.e.f. 1.9.2000 till today and onwards. The Hon'ble Tribunal further directed the Respondents that the Petitioners are also entitled to corresponding benefits under the Fifth Central Pay Commission Report, which had been accepted by the Govt.; and further directed that Respondents should comply with the aforesaid directions within 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. Copy of the judgment is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure CP-1.

3. That the Respondents, however, challenged the aforesaid judgment by filing a Civil Writ Petition No. 5882/2002 which was, however, dismissed vide order dated 10.8.2010, a copy of which is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure CP-2.

4. That the Respondents, thereafter, filed a SLP in case of Union of India & Ors. Vs. Manoj Kumar Srivasatava & Ors., which case was decided along with judgment of the Petitioner in a common judgment but the Hon'ble Supreme Court also dismissed the SLP vide order dated 18.3.2011, a copy of which is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure CP-3.

4

(5)

5. Since the Respondents failed to comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Tribunal, upheld by Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Petitioner filed a Contempt Petition on 17.11.2011 Cont.-CAS(C) 840/2011 which came up for hearing on 18.11.2011 and this Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to allow the Petitioner to withdraw the CP with liberty to move a CP before Central Administrative Tribunal, as alleged non compliance as per order of the Hon'ble Tribunal. A copy of the order is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure CP-4.**

6. The Respondents have failed to comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Tribunal in OA No. 1684/2000 decided on 12.12.2001, upheld by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court vide order dated 10.8.2010 and further confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 18.3.2011. The Respondents have not only not made the payment of the amount due to the Petitioner in pursuance of the judgment, have also not cared to communicate any order in this regard and have thus committed an offence under Contempt of Court Act.

PRAYER:

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that, in the interest of justice, this Hon'ble Tribunal, may be graciously pleased to:-

L

- (i) Order registration of a case against the respondents under Contempt of Court Act and direct them to appear before this Hon'ble Tribunal, in person, to explain their conduct and also to comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Tribunal without any further delay.

Place: New Delhi

Date: 18/12/11

Through

Man Chand.

Petitioner

[Meenu Mainee & B.S. Mainee]

Advocates

2-A-33,34, GC Grand, Vaibhav Khand
Indirapuram, Ghaziabad

(7)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI

CP _____/2011
IN
O.A.NO 1684/2000

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Mam Chand

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Of India & Ors

...Respondents

by

AFFIDAVIT



I, Amarjit Singh, S/o Shri Indar Singh, J.E. (Works) under Dy. CE (Const), Northern Railway, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:-

1. That the deponent is the petitioner in the Contempt Petition and is, therefore, well conversant with the facts of the case.
2. That the Contempt Petition has been drafted under the instructions of the deponent, the contents of which, are true and correct.

(M. Saini)

Verification:

I, Amarjit Singh S/o Shri Indar Singh, do hereby verify that the contents of the above affidavit are true and correct and nothing material has been suppressed there-from.

[Meenu Mainee & B.S. Mainee]
Advocates

(M. Saini)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI

CP _____/2011
IN
O.A.NO 1684/2000

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Mam Chand

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Of India & Ors

...Respondents

by



AFFIDAVIT

I, Dharam veer, S/o Shri ChetRam, J.E. (Works) under Dy. CE (Const), Northern Railway, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:-

1. That the deponent is the petitioner in the Contempt Petition and is, therefore, well conversant with the facts of the case.
2. That the Contempt Petition has been drafted under the instructions of the deponent, the contents of which, are true and correct.

Verification:

I, Dharamveer, S/o Shri ChetRam, do hereby verify that the contents of the above affidavit are true and correct and nothing material has been suppressed there-from.


[Meenu Mainee & B.S. Mainee]
Advocates






BA

Draft Charges

WHEREAS this Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to dispose of the O.A. No. 1684/2000 filed by the Petitioner and had directed the Respondents to accord the benefit of revised pay scale of 1400-2300 notionally w.e.f. 1.1.1986 and actually from the date of filing this O.A. i.e. w.e.f. 1.9.2000 till today and onwards.

Whereas the Hon'ble Tribunal further directed the Respondents that Petitioners are entitled to corresponding benefit under the Fifth Central Pay Commission Report which had already been accepted by the Govt. The Hon'ble Tribunal further directed the Respondents to comply with the directions within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

Whereas the judgment of this Hon'ble Tribunal has been upheld by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Respondents have failed to comply with their therefore, is a clear attempt to disobey the orders and, therefore, the Respondents are liable to be hauled up for the Contempt of Court.

Place: New Delhi

Date: 18/12/14

Through

Meenu Mainee
Petitioner

[Meenu Mainee & B.S. Mainee]

Advocates

2-A-33,34, GC Grand, Vaibhav Khand
Indirapuram, Ghaziabad

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL (PB)
AT NEW DELHI

OA No. 1684 / 2000

MA No. 2083 / 2000

New Delhi this the 12th day of December, 2001

Hon'ble Mr. Govindan S. Tampi, Member (Admn.)

Hon'ble Mr. Shanker Raju, Member (Judicial)

Sh. Mam Chand,
S/o Late Sh. Soran Singh,
Suboverser Mistry (Work Mistry),
under Chief Administrative Officer (Const.),
Northern Railway,
Kashmeri Gate, Delhi &
5 Other as per Memo of Parties ...Applicants
(By Advocate Sh. B.S. Mainee)

Versus

Union of India : through

1. The General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House,
New Delhi.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer (Constn.)
Northern Railway,
Kashmeri Gate,
Delhi ...Respondents

(By Advocate Sh. R.L. Dhawan)

ORDER (Oral)

By Mr. Shanker Raju, Member (J) :

MA for joining together is allowed.

2. The applicants in this case have sought directions to the respondents to fix their salary in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

extending benefit of their earlier working as temporary status holders in the category of Suboverseer Mistry (SOM) w.e.f. 1.1.86 and the category of SOM was placed in the same grade alongwith fixation of their pay with all consequential benefits.

3. Briefly stated, the applicants are qualified Draftsmen having passed two years certificate course have applied for the posts of SOM. Alongwith the applicants diploma holders were also considered and no distinction had been made at that time. The applicants have been appointed as daily wages in the year 1983 on the same pay scale which was given to the diploma holders. After implementation of the Fourth Central Pay Commission's recommendations the applicants alongwith diploma holders have been placed in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 but in the year 1988 the pay scale of diploma holders has been enhanced to rs. 1320-2040 and to diploma holders it has been decreased to Rs. 950-1500. OA 264/89 had been filed which was allowed with the directions to

Certified to be a True Copy of Original
Meenu Mainee

the respondents to place the applicants in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 seeking regularisation. Diploma holders SOMs filed OA 359/89 where directions have been issued for their regularisation. They have been regularised in the year 1994 and were placed in the pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300. This decision has not been extended to the certificate holders which was challenged in OA 1419/94 which was allowed on 29.1.96 by directing the respondents to consider the applicants alongwith others for appointment as SOMs in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 against direct recruitment quota. In pursuance thereof selection was held and the applicants were selected for the posts of Mistry Works/SOM in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 by letter dated 6.3.1997. The Railway Recruitment Board passed orders to appoint applicants w.e.f. 11.4.1997 and 22.4.97 respectively. The pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 was allotted to SOMs w.e.f. 1.1.86. The respondents have not paid it either to the diploma or certificate holders on the ground of their non-regularisation. The benefit of


Certified to be a True Copy of Original

earlier period for the purpose of fixation of pay to the applicants has not been accorded by the respondents. The applicants filed representations. Diploma holders being aggrieved by non-accord of fixation of pay in the grade Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 approached this Tribunal in OA 1443/95, which was allowed on 26.10.99.


4. The learned counsel for the applicants contended by taking resort to the decision of the Tribunal in OA 1443/95 that the applicants are similarly circumstance and cannot be deprived of the fixation of pay and benefit of revised pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 notionally and actually from the date of filing of the OA. It is also stated that the applicants are working as SOMs from their initial appointment and the proper pay scale of SOM was Rs. 1400-2300. As they had been performing the duties and responsibilities of the work Mistry, on the doctrine of equal pay for equal work they cannot be deprived of the pay scale. According to them before regularisation they were

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee


drawing Rs. 1560/- in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 but the salary has been fixed without giving any benefit of fixation of pay as per rules in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300. The applicants have been working continuously with temporary status against regular vacancies, as such in view of the provisions of Rule 2005 of the IREM Volume-II having temporary status they are entitled to get the same pay scale as given to diploma holders. As the Fourth Central Pay Commission has recommended only one grade of SOM, i.e., Rs. 1400-2300 the applicants are entitled to get the same pay scale for the purpose of their pay fixation.

5. On the other hand, the respondents in their reply have stated that earlier the applicants have filed OA 1419/94 for appointment as SOMs in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 and thereafter filed OA 2047/97 seeking correct seniority as SOMs. As the applicants have prayed their placement in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 which is a consequential benefit


Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

of regularisation as well as seniority and having failed to assail their grievance and their failure to pray for placement in the said grade in the earlier OAs, the present OA is barred by the doctrine of Res judicate as well as constructive res judicata in view of the decision of the Apex Court in **Commissioner of Income Tax vs. T.P. Kumaran**, SLJ 1996 (3) SC 101. It is also stated that the decision in OA 1443/95 would have no application in the case of the applicants as the Railway Board's circular dated 2.1.87 has no application on employees working in the construction unit. It is also stated that in pursuance of the directions of this Court the applicants have not been regularised but appointed as SOMs, as such they are not entitled for calculating the period of temporary status towards fixation of pay. The respondents have further taken a preliminary objection that the OA is barred by limitation and the cause of action is not continuing and recurring as the applicants are praying


Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

15

for their placement in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 and having filed their representations only on 14.9.97 the OA is not maintainable in view of Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. It is further stated that on the basis of a decision of the Court no cause of action can arise for the purpose of limitation in view of the decision of the Apex Court in **Bhoop Singh vs. Union of India**, ATR 1992 (2) SC 278. It is also stated that in view of the decision of the Full Bench in Yasim Khan's Case two years certificate holders are not eligible for direct recruitment but for the directions of this Court in OA 1419/94 the applicants have been considered and appointed. It is only those SOMs who are possessing diploma are placed in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 and as the applicants are unqualified they are correctly placed in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040. They have been appointed as Supervisors (Works) in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 in pursuance of the directions

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

of this Court. They have been accorded pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 in compliance of an order passed by the Tribunal on 1.6.94. Only open lines establishment are eligible to be placed in the grade or Rs. 1400-2300. The applicants in the construction are not entitled for the same.


6. In the rejoinder, the learned counsel for the applicants stated that in view of Rule 10 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 while the previous petitions have been filed against reducing the pay scale as well as for regularisation and seniority where the consequential relief is promotion but fixation of their pay scale, which is a continuing and recurring cause of action in view of the decision of the Apex Court in M.R Gupta vs. Union of India, 1995 (5) SCALE 29 the claim of the applicants if raised for fixation of pay in the earlier OAs would have certainly amount to seeking plural remedies and as such as the grievance of pay scale has not been

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

adjudicated and finally settled there shall be any applicability of constructive res judicata in the case as well as the limitation. The applicants though claiming benefit of the judgement but yet in view of placement of SOMs in one grade w.e.f. 1.1.86 by the Fourth Central Pay Commission the applicants are also entitled to be considered for the same in view of paragraph 2005 of IREM, Volume II.

7. We have carefully considered the revival contentions of the parties and perused the material on record. The preliminary objection of the respondents regarding constructive res judicata would have no application in the facts and circumstances of the present case. The applicants have earlier filed OAs before this court against reduction of pay scale, seniority and regularisation where the present grievance of placement in the pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 cannot be raised as a consequential relief and would have been barred by the provisions of plural remedies contained in Rule 10 of the Central


Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987. As such, as the claim of placement in the pay scale could not have been raised and had not been adjudicated upon, it cannot be observed that the applicants despite having opportunity, have not raised the same in the earlier OAs. As such the doctrine of constructive res judicata would have no application in the present circumstances.

8. As regards the limitation is concerned, after the decision in OA 1443/95 on 26.10.99 similarly circumstances SOMs have been accorded the benefit of pay scale w.e.f. 1.1.86 the applicants who are claiming benefit of this decision have filed representations and have come before this Court within the stipulated period of limitation. Apart from it, in the matter of placement in the pay scale the cause of action arises on every first day of the month and is a recurring cause of action and in view of the decision of the Apex Court in M.R. Gupta's case (supra) the claim of the applicants cannot be

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

treated as barred by limitation. The objection of the respondents cannot be upheld.

9. As regards the merits are concerned, the case of the applicants is on all fours covered by the decision of this Court in OA 1443/95 wherein after meticulously going into the right of placement in the pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 and placing reliance on Rule 2005 IREM *ibid.*, where casual labours after being granted temporary status are entitled to the same rights and benefits as admissible to temporary status Railway servants, including the pay scale and keeping in view the Fourth Central Pay Commission's report where only one grade of SOM has been recommended, i.e., Rs. 1400-2300 and the fact that the letter written by the Deputy Chief Engineer regarding carrying duties and responsibilities at par with the IOW Grade III as well as Board's circular dated 2.1.87 the applicants who have been previously equated with the SOM Diploma holders and in view of the recommendations

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

of the Fourth Central Pay Commission as there is only one pay scale of Rs. 1400-23000 the applicants cannot be deprived of their placement in the said pay scale of Rs. 1400-23000. Admittedly they are performing the same work as done by the diploma holders right from their initial appointment. The delay in regularisation of the applicants cannot deprive and forfeit their service prior to that date. As per the provisions of para 2005 of IREM the applicants cannot be discriminated on the ground that they belong to construction division.

10. In this view of the matter and having regard to the reason recorded above, we find that the claim of the applicants for being placed in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300 is legally sustainable. The present OA is allowed with direction to the respondents to accord them benefit of revised pay scale of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86 notionally and actually from the date of filing of this OA, i.e. w.e.f. 1.9.2000 till today and onwards. The

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

applicants are also entitled to corresponding benefit under the Fifth Central Pay Commission's report, which has been accepted by the Government. These directions shall be complied with by the respondents within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Sd/-
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

Sd/-
(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

Certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

(18/1) Ann. exp. 2
22

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
EXTRA ORDINARY CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

CIVIL WRIT PETITION No. _____/ 2002

IN THE MATTER OF

UNION OF INDIA & ORs PETITIONERS

VS

Shri MAM CHAND & ORs RESPONDENTS

MEMO OF PARTIES

UNION OF INDIA, through

1. The General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House,
NEW DELHI-110 001
2. The Chief Administrative Officer (Construction),
Northern Railway,
Kashmere Gate,
DELHI-110 006

..... PETITIONERS

V E R S U S

1. Shri Mam Chand, s/o
Shri Soran Singh
SOM,
c/o Dy. Chief Engineer/CM,
Northern Railway, CHANDIGARH
2. Shri Dharam Vir, s/o
Shri Chet Ram,
SOM,
c/o Dy. Chief Engr. (Construction)
Northern Rly. Patel Nagar, NEW DELHI
3. Shri Amarjit Singh s/o
Sh. Inder Singh,
SOM
c/o SEN (C), Northern Rly,
LUDHIANA (pb)
4. Shri Ravi Lal s/o
Shri Kalu Ram
SOM,
c/o Dy. Chief Engineer (Construction),
Northern Rly, CHANDIGARH
5. Shri Rajinder Kumar, s/o
Shri Sadhu Ram,
SOM
c/o Dy. Chief Engineer (Construction),
Northern Rly. CHANDIGARH

Certified to be a True Copy of Original


Meenu Mainee

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CONT.CAS(C) 840/2011 and C.M. Nos.20872-73/2011

MAM CHAND and ORS Petitioner

Through: Ms. Meenu Mainee, Advocate

versus

S.BUDLA KOTI and ANR. Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

18.11.2011

Counsel for the petitioner wishes to withdraw this petition with liberty to move a contempt petition before the CAT, as the alleged non compliance is that of the order of the CAT.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

NOVEMBER 18, 2011

sr

36

certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee

certified to be a True Copy of Original

Meenu Mainee