

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

~~OA/TA/TA~~ / CCP No. 46 of 1992 in OA-674/88
Rameshwar Dayal Shri B. S. Mainee
 APPLICANT (S) COUNSEL

VERSUS
G.M., N.Railway & Ors.
 RESPONDENT (S) COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>27.1.1992</p> <p>Present : Shri B. L. Madhok, proxy counsel for Shri B. S. Mainee, counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>Issue notice to respondents returnable on 13.3.1992. Personal presence of the respondents is dispensed with for the time being.</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> (P. C. JAIN) MEMBER (A)</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> (V. S. MALIMATH) CHAIRMAN</p>
	<p>R-1-1992-273 27.1.1992</p>	<p>13.3.1992</p> <p>Present : Shri B. L. Madhok, proxy counsel for Shri B. S. Mainee, counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>None for respondent No.1 though served. Intimation of service on respondent No.2 is still awaited. Call on 26.3.1992.</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> (J. P. Sharma) Member (J)</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> (P. C. Jain) Member (A)</p>

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p data-bbox="690 285 1098 356"><u>26.3.92</u> CCP 46/92 in <u>OA 674/88</u></p> <p data-bbox="728 400 1538 471">Petitioner through Shri B.L. Madhok, proxy for Shri B.S. Mainee, Counsel.</p> <p data-bbox="745 514 1599 1039">Respondent No. 1 is duly served. None appears for him. So far as Respondent No. 2 is concerned, more than 30 days have elapsed after the notice was sent by Registered post to the correct address. Neither the acknowledgement is received nor the notice has returned unserved.</p> <p data-bbox="745 1082 1615 1694">Hence, notice to Respondent No. 2 is deemed to have been duly served. As we are <u>prima facie</u> satisfied that there is no compliance with the judgement of the Tribunal dated 17.5.1991, we direct Respondent No. 1 to remain personally present before the Tribunal on <u>21.4.1992</u> for taking further action under the Contempt of Courts Act.</p> <p data-bbox="745 1737 1554 2102">If before that date the judgement is fully complied with, we reserve liberty to move us for recalling the order of personal presence. Let a copy of the order be sent to both the respondents.</p> <div data-bbox="740 2127 933 2247"><p data-bbox="794 2127 883 2165"><i>Ce</i></p><p data-bbox="740 2173 933 2247">(P.C.JAIN) MEMBER(A)</p></div> <div data-bbox="1240 2063 1528 2247"><p data-bbox="1321 2063 1462 2153"><i>Thi</i></p><p data-bbox="1240 2173 1528 2247">(V.S. MALIMATH) CHAIRMAN</p></div>

SRD

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p><u>13.4.92</u> <u>MP 1096/92.</u></p> <p>Petitioner through Shri B.K. Aggarwal, Counsel.</p> <p>On behalf of the respondents Shri B.L. Madan, proxy for Shri B.S. Mainee, Counsel, is present.</p> <p>M.P. 1096/92 for exemption from personal presence of Respondent No. 1 is allowed.</p> <div><div>SRD</div><div>(P.C. JAIN) MEMBER(A)</div><div>(V.S. MALIMATH) CHAIRMAN</div></div>
	<p>Reply filed</p>	

20 3
4.

CCP 46/92

QA 674/88

21.04.92

Present: Shri B.S.Mainee, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri B.K.Agarwal, counsel for the respdts.

In the light of the rejoinder filed by the petitioner, we grant 6 weeks' time to the respondents to examine if the directions of the Tribunal have been properly and satisfactorily complied with, and if not, to take appropriate steps for full compliance. For that purpose, we adjourned this case and direct the listing of this case on 08.07.92.

P.C. Jain
(P.C.JAIN)

MEMBER (A)

V.S. Malimath
(V.S.MALIMATH)

CHAIRMAN

8.7.1992

Present : Shri B. S. Mainee, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri B. K. Aggarwal, counsel for the respondents.

Call on 16.7.1992.

B. O.
C. O. C-1

Advt. Affidavit filed.