

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

REGN. NO. CCP 310/91 in  
DA 1146/87

DATE OF DECISION: 14.2.1992

Mangat Ram

... Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India

... Respondent.

REGN NO. CCP 309/91 in  
DA 1155/87

Amar Ram

.... Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India

... Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.  
HON'BLE MR. S. GURUSANKARAN, MEMBER(A).

For the Petitioner.

... Shri Sanjeev Madan,  
Counsel.

For the Respondent.

... Shri R.L. Dhawan,  
Counsel.


JUDGEMENT (ORAL)


(Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Malimath,  
Chairman)

We do not find any good ground to initiate action under the Contempt of Courts Act having regard to the clear observations made in the judgement. The complaint in this case is that the directions given by the judgement of the Tribunal have not been complied with. The relief claimed by the petitioner was not granted by the Tribunal being satisfied that the petitioner has failed to make out any case. After saying so, the Tribunal said that if the petitioner now approaches the authority, they may consider his suitability for being included in the Live Casual Labour Register in accordance with the circulars and instructions issued by them. The representations made by the petitioner subsequent to the judgement of the Tribunal would not give them a right for being included in the Live Casual

12

Labour Register for the reason that a date had been fixed for the purpose for inclusion in the said register. It is in this background that Shri Sanjeev Madan, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that irrespective of the last date fixed for inclusion in the Live Casual Labour Register, the suitability of the petitioner should have been examined for inclusion in the said register. We do not find it possible to accede to this request. After holding that the petitioner has no case for grant of relief, the Tribunal has observed that if the petitioner now makes a request, it may be considered in accordance with the orders governing the subject. There is nothing to indicate that the conditions stipulated in the orders should be ignored so far as the petitioner is concerned. We, therefore, see no good ground to take action under the Contempt of Courts Act. Contempt of Courts proceedings are accordingly dropped.

  
(S. GURUSANKARAN)  
MEMBER (A)  
14.2.1992.

  
(V. S. MALIMATH)  
CHAIRMAN  
14.2.1992.