

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Jaipur Bench, Jaipur**

**C.P. No. 14/2020
O.A. No. 756/2019**

Date of decision: 19.08.2020

**Hon'ble Mr. Dinesh Sharma, Member (A)
Hon'ble Smt. Hina P. Shah, Member (J)**

R.P.Meena S/o S.L.Meena, aged about 51 years 6 months, Ex. Dy Chief Safety Officer (Traffic), North Western Railway, Jaipur Now Resident of A-21, Ashish Vihar, RBI Colony, Jagatpura, (Rajasthan) - 302017 (Gr 'A') Mobile 9509296965.

....Petitioner

(Petitioner in person)

Versus

1. Shri S.K.Mishra, Secretary, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi-110 001.
2. Shri Anand Prakash, General Manager, North Western Railway, Jaipur, H.O. Near Jawahar Circle, Jaipur-302017 (Raj).

...Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri Anupam Agarwal)

ORDER (ORAL)

Per: Dinesh Sharma, Member (A)

In this Contempt Petition, the petitioner, who is appearing in person, stated that the order dated 18.12.2019 passed by this Tribunal has not been complied with. Order passed by this Tribunal is reproduced below:-

"After arguing the matter for some time, learned counsel for the applicant wishes to withdraw the present Original Application with liberty to pursue his

(2)

remedy of filing a representation before the respondents in terms of order dated 03.12.2019 (Annexure-A/1).

If such a representation is submitted by the applicant within the period as stipulated in the order dated 03.12.2019, the same shall be considered by the competent authority and a reasoned and speaking order shall be passed over the same as per the policy guidelines.

Accordingly, the Original Application is disposed of with liberty to the applicant as aforesaid."

2. Notices were issued to the respondents and the reply has been filed in which they have informed that a reasoned and speaking order has been passed vide order dated 04.05.2020 (Annexure CPR/1). They have also apologized for the delay in complying with the order of this Tribunal.

3. The case was heard. The petitioner (appearing as party in person) argued that the order dated 4.5.2020 is not a reasoned and speaking order. Hence, the order passed by the respondents does not comply with the order of this Tribunal.

4. We have gone through the order dated 04.05.2020 (Annexure CPR/1) and find that the order is apparently a reasoned and speaking order. The petitioner may not agree with the reasons given in the order and may still be aggrieved with the decision, but that cannot be a subject

(3)

matter to be decided in this contempt petition. We are fully satisfied that the order dated 04.05.2020 (Annexure CPR/1) passed by the respondents is a reasoned and speaking order and it is in sufficient compliance of the observation made by this Tribunal, in our order dated 18.12.2019 (while allowing the applicant to withdraw his OA, with liberty to pursue his remedy). Hence, the Contempt Petition is dismissed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

(Hina P. Shah)
Member (J)

(Dinesh Sharma)
Member (A)

/kdr/