

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

CCP No. 108/90 in
O.A. No. 1640/87.

~~Tracking~~

~~100x~~

DATE OF DECISION 14.11.1990.

Raja Ram Kr. Sharma

Petitioner

Petitioner in person.

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Sh. V.D. Maheswari, S.P(HQ),

Respondent

C.B.I. New Delhi.

Shri K.C. Mishra

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN.

The Hon'ble Mr. M.M. MATHUR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? */*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? *no*

ORDER

We have heard the Applicant in person on C.C.P. 108/90 in O.A. 1640/87. This Petition has been filed by the original Applicant in O.A. 1640/87 which was disposed of by this Tribunal's judgment dated 4.5.1989. He had challenged the verbal order of Respondents dated 21.8.1987 whereby his services were terminated. The Tribunal did not find merit in the Application and held that the Applicant was not entitled to the reliefs sought for by him. The Application was dismissed with the observation that in case the Respondents need the services of a person to do the work of seasonal nature, the Applicant should be considered for the same in preference to others.

2. Thereafter the original Applicant filed R.A. 66/89

.....2/

which was dismissed by the Tribunal vide judgment dated 25.8.1989.

3. In the present Petition the Applicant has alleged that the Respondents have committed contempt of court as they did not comply with the directions contained in the judgment. He has stated that the Respondents directed him to appear for interview on 21st and 25th August, 1989; but he was not interviewed even though he signed statement of candidates called for interview.

4. The Respondents have stated in their reply that the Applicant did not attend the interview.

5. We cannot go into disputed question of fact in the C.C.P. It may be that the Respondents have implemented the judgment of the Tribunal according to their understanding. There is no ex facie contempt committed by the Respondents. In case the Applicant wants to agitate the matter further, he will have to file a fresh Application in accordance with law, if so advised. The C.C.P. is disposed of accordingly and the notice of contempt is discharged.


(M.M. MATHUR) 14/11/90
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER


(P.K. KARTHA) 14/11/90
VICE CHAIRMAN