

IN THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

CP-48/95 in  
OA-2183/89

Date of decision 27.7.95

with  
CP-28/95 in  
OA-712/91

Hon'ble Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman (A)  
Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

1) CP-48/95 in  
OA-2183/89

Shri Ramesh Chandra  
s/o Shri Hira Ballabh,  
r/o D-153, P&T Qrs., Moti Bagh,  
New Delhi

... Applicant

(None for the petitioner )

Versus

1. Shri S.P. Singh,  
Superintending Engineer,  
C.P.W.D. DCC-VI,  
East Block, R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi-110066
2. Shri K.L. Langer,  
Executive Engineer,  
C.P.W.D. East Block IV,  
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110066
3. Shri Satya Vir Singh,  
the Assistant Engineer,  
2/M. Sub Division, East Block,  
Ground Floor, R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi-110066

... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri B. Lall )

2) CP-28/1995 in  
OA-712/91

1. Shri Ram Nath Singh  
s/o Sh. Charan Singh,  
r/o 5-H, Aram Bagh, New Delhi.
2. Shri Man Singh Rajput,  
s/o Shri Ram Singh,  
r/o 5-H, Aram Bagh,  
New Delhi-110005

... Applicants

(None for the petitioners)

Versus

1. Shri K.K. Madan,  
Director General (Works),  
C.P.W.D. Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi
2. Shri K.K. Khanna,  
Chief Engineer,  
PWD, Delhi Administration,  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi.

- (3)
3. Shri K.B. Rajauria,  
Chief Engineer, PWD,  
Delhi Administration,  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi.
  4. Shri Rajesh Mittal,  
Executive Engineer,  
Parliament Works Division-2,  
CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi
  5. Shri A.K.Mittal,  
Executive Engineer  
(Civil, PD-II),  
PWD (Delhi Administration),  
Din Dayal Upadhyay Hospital,  
Hari Nagar, New Delhi

... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri B.Lall )

ORDER (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Shri N.V.Krishnan, Vice Chairman (A))

None for the petitioners in the two Contempt Petitions though called twice. Shri B.Lall appeared for the respondents. We note that on 5-7-1995 the learned counsel for the respondents were given time to complete compliance of the Tribunal's order. Learned counsel for the respondents produces for our perusal three orders in respect of the appointment of the three petitioners in the two petitions. They are kept on record. He states at the Bar that the petitioners have also joined. It is perhaps for these reasons that the petitioners have not appeared before us. In the circumstances we find that nothing remains in the Contempt petitions. Accordingly, notices issued to the respondents are discharged and the petition dismissed. 10

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)

(N.V.Krishnan )  
Vice Chairman (A)

sk