

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**



**CP No.195/2020  
in  
OA No.2874/2018  
MA No.201/2020  
MA No.298/2020  
MA No.1905/2020  
and  
RA No.91/2020**

Today this the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2020

Through video conferencing

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

Kuwajit Kaur  
W/o Sh. Ajay Kumar  
R/o WZ-37/66, Shrinagar  
Shakurbasti,  
New Delhi-110034.

...Applicant

(Advocate: Mr. Manish Shekhari)

Versus

1. Dr. Ajay Kumar, Secretary, Ministry of Defence  
Union of India, South Block  
New Delhi.
2. Lt. Gen. Sanjay Chauhan  
Director General of Quality Assurance  
Government of India, Ministry of Defence  
Production, DGQA, New Delhi.
3. Mr. Prahalad Meena  
The Additional DGQA (Stores)  
Department of Defence Production(DGQA/S-1)  
Ministry of Defence, DHQ PO, New Delhi-110011.
4. Col. Rajneesh Trivedi, Commanding Officer  
Sr. Quality Assurance Estt. (GS)  
Anand Parbat, Military Road  
New Delhi-110005.

..Respondents

(Advocate : Mr. Shailender Tiwari)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:****MA No.201/2020 in RA No.91/2020.**

This application is filed with a prayer to condone the delay of 166 days in filing the RA. It is stated that the delay occurred on account of administrative reasons and in processing the file, and then there is no willful delay on their part. However, the respondent (applicant in the OA) has raised a serious objection as regards to the maintainability of the MA. According to him Rule -17 of CAT (Procedure) Rules not only stipulates limitation for filing the RA but does not confer power to condone delay. He placed reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K. Ajit Babu vs. Union of India*** (1997) 6 SCC 473 and the judgment of Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh High Court in ***G. Narsimha Rao Vs. Regional Joint Director of School*** 2003 SCC Online AP 1068.

2. We heard Mr. Shailendra Tiwari, learned counsel for the applicant herein and Mr. Manish Shekhar, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. The applicant no doubt, has pleaded certain reasons, which may otherwise enable the Tribunal to condone the delay. The fact, however, remains the Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh held that the Tribunal does not have the power to condone the delay in filing the case

for review. Following the same, we dismiss the MA . As a result, the RA also stands dismissed.



**CP No.195/2020**

4. This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the order dated 31.05.2019 in OA No.2874/2018. The applicant is working as JTO in the Director General of Quality Assurance, Ministry of Defence Production, New Delhi. Through an order dated 19.07.2017, she was transferred from Delhi to Kanpur. Similar orders of transfers were also passed in respect of other employees. Those orders were challenged in OA No.2791/2017 in Smt. Alka Chauhan and others vs. Union of India and others. On her part, the applicant filed OA No.4531/2017 challenging the order of transfer. While OA No.4531/2017 was disposed of on 20.12.2017 directing that the representation made by the applicant be considered and a reasoned order be passed within a period of two months, and OA No.2791/2017 was decided on merits on 17.12.2018. The order in that OA specifically mentioned that an interim order was passed on 19.08.2017 and the relief was granted in favour of two out of three applicants.

5. The representation made by the applicant was disposed of on 21.05.2018. That was challenged in OA No.2874/2018. Through an order dated 31.05.2019 in MA No.1912/2019 the hearing of the OA was advanced on a representation made by the applicant that her case stands on the same footing as those of the applicants in OA No.2791/2017. On the same day, the OA

No.2874/2018 was disposed of, in terms of order passed in OA No.2791/2017.



6. The applicant contends that though her OA was disposed of in terms of the order in OA No.2791/2017, the respondents are not permitting her to join duties at Delhi. The respondents have, in turn, filed a review application together with an application for condonation of delay. Today itself, we dismissed the application for condonation of delay and the RA on an objection raised by the applicant herein that the Tribunal does not have the power to condone the delay

7. We heard Shri Manish Shekhari, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Shailendra Tiwary, learned counsel for the respondents in this CP.

8. The applicant was transferred from a station at New Delhi, to Kanpur, way back on 19.07.2017. She challenged the order of transfer by pleading that her left out service is three years and she is entitled to remain at Delhi in the last leg of her service. OA No.2874/2017 filed by her was disposed of on 31.05.2019 just by observing that the representation made by her be disposed of. In contrast, in OA No.2791/2017, an interim order was passed on 19.08.2017. That fact was taken into account when the said OA was disposed of on 17.12.2018 and the relief was granted to some of the applicants therein.

9. The challenge in OA No.2874/2018 was to an order of rejection of representation. Not a word was said about the stay,



or the facts stated therein. We are not either reviewing the order of the Tribunal in the OA. We are only mentioning the fact that there did not exist any interim order, in favour of the applicant, at any stage. From 19.07.2017 till 17.12.2018, i.e., for about one and a half years, it is clear that the applicant did not have the benefit of interim order. She has remained out of service and till today she did not join the duty. One can really imagine the impact of such an attitude in an important organization like the DGQA. Since there is no clear finding about the legality or otherwise of the order of transfer, or the rejection of the representation submitted by the applicant, coupled with the fact that there did not exist any interim order in her favour which entitle her to remain at Delhi, we are of the view that the respondents cannot be said to have committed contempt of court. The contempt case is accordingly closed.

All ancillary applications stand disposed of.

**(A. K. Bishnoi)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**