

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. No.439/2000 In  
O.A. NO.1510/91

(51)

New Delhi this the 30th day of January, 2001

Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

Vinod Krishna Kaul, IPS (Retd.)  
R/o A-9 Pamposh Enclave,  
Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi-110048

-Petitioner

(By Advocate: Shri H.K. Gupta)

Versus

1. Shri Kamal Pande, IAS  
Secretary to the Government of India,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block, Central Secretariat,  
New Delhi-110001

2. Shri Inderjit Khanna, IAS  
Chief Secretary to the Government  
of Rajasthan,  
The Secretariat,  
Jaipur.

-Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri K.C.D. Gangwani, R-1 and  
Kumari Sandhya Goswami, R-2)

ORDER (Oral)

Mr. V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

Vide an undated application filed in January 2001, the petitioner had sought permission for exemption from personal attendance for 30.1.2001 i.e. the date of hearing in the present petition on medical ground. This application is allowed.

2. The applicant has alleged in the Contempt Petition that the respondents did not comply with directions made in order dated 7.1.2000 in OA-1510/91. In their compliance affidavit, the respondents have contended that they had filed an MA seeking extension of two months from 1.4.2000 for implementing the directions made in the order dated

11/

(2)

7.1.2000. Before the MA could be decided, the arrears of pay and leave encashment were released to the petitioner on 16.6.2000 and 20.8.2000 respectively. Interest on the arrears of pay and leave encashment was also paid to the applicant on 9.1.2001. In addition, the cost and the interest thereon amounting to Rs. 1,120/- was also paid to the petitioner. As per rejoinder filed by the petitioner, the Government of Rajasthan have also released a sum of Rs. 3971 being the interest on delayed payment of pension, arrears and commutation arrears. As the petitioner has been paid all arrears of pay and other dues along with interest, there should not be any ground for grievance to the petitioner. In our view, no case is made out for contempt under the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act against the respondents.

(52)

3. The C.P. is, therefore, dismissed and the notices under the Contempt of Courts Act against the respondents are discharged.

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju)  
Member (J)

cc.

V.K. Majotra

(V.K. Majotra)  
Member (A)  
30.1.2001