

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

CCP No.157/91 in
O.A. No. 2592/89
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 23.8.91

Mrs. R.C. Asrani, _____ Petitioner
 Petitioner in person. _____ Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
 Versus
 Union of India & ors. _____ Respondents
 Shri P.P. Khurana, _____ Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

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

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K. CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER(A)

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? */ No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? */ No*

ORDER

(ORDER OF THE BENCH PASSED BY HON'BLE MR.D.K.
 CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER)

The petitioner who is the applicant in OA No.2592/89 has alleged that the respondents have not complied with the judgement of the Tribunal dated 20.4.90.

2. The Tribunal had held in its judgement dated 20.4.90 that the respondents have complied with the directions of the Tribunal as regards the payment of pay and allowances and terminal benefits to her together with interest upto 28.9.1979, when she would have attained the age of 60 years, had she continued in service. However, as regards recoveries made by the respondents on account of licence fee from the amounts payable to her, the respondents were directed to verify whether

2

they have taken into account the amounts recovered from her pay from March, 1978 as well as her leave salary of 112 days which were handed over to the Director of Estates. The Tribunal further directed that any excess recovery, licence fee/damages for the period from 28.5.78 to 28.8.79 should be refunded to the petitioner together with interest at the rate of 12% per annum.

3. The respondents have stated in their reply affidavit that the recovery made from her as well as leave salary of 112 days had been taken into account by them while calculating the net amount of Rs. 57,801.50 due from her. They have also clarified that she was charged only normal licence fee upto 26.11.79 (Vide Annexure R VIII to the reply affidavit, page 33 of the paper-book).

4. In the light of the above, we are satisfied that the respondents have not committed any contempt, as alleged in this petition. The CCP is accordingly dismissed and the notice of contempt discharged.

D.K. Chakravorty
(D.K. CHAKRAVORTY)
MEMBER(A)

P.K. Kartha
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)