

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

(38)

CP 30/96 in
OA 2476/92

Date of decision 3-10-1996

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri R.K. Ahooja, Member (A)
in the matter of

1. Shri Parkash s/o Shri Sanwal.
2. Shri Dilbag Singh s/o Shri Moji Ram
3. Shri Ganesh S/o Shri Ghisa Lal

R/o C/O Hari Om Gaur, Gaur Bhawan,
Gali No.40, Sadh Nagar-II,
Palam Colony, New Delhi.

.... Applicants
(By Advocate Shri V.P.Sharma, through
proxy counsel Shri Yogesh Sharma)

Vs.

1. Shri Ramesh Chand Tripathi,
Divisional Railway Manager,
Jaipur DN, Jaipur (Raj.)

.... Respondent
(By Advocate Shri R.L.Dhawan)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

This Contempt Petition has been filed by the applicants alleging ~~for~~ non implementation of the order dated 1.3.95 in OA 2476/92, which was one of the cases in the bunch of cases listed together with O.A. 2394/92.

2. The case of the applicants is that they have in pursuance of the aforesaid judgment submitted a detailed representation together with proof of their service with the respondents to consider their case for inclusion in the Live Casual Labour Register.

This fact is, however, denied by the respondents who have submitted that the petitioners S/Shri Parkash,

8.

(39)

Ganesh and Dilbag Singh have not given their complete service particulars i.e. working ~~of~~¹⁸ days with documentary proof. It is also noted that in all these cases, their representations are stated to be undated, which appear to be correct from the copy of the representations submitted by Shri Parkash (copy placed at page 16-17 of the paper book.)

3. After considering the submissions made by both the learned counsel and the pleadings, we are satisfied that this is not a case where there is wilful or contumacious disobedience of the order dated 1.3.1995. However, we note that it is a question of fact whether the petitioners in OA 2476/92 had submitted the requisite service records for consideration of the respondents as directed in that order.

4. In the facts and circumstances of the case while this C.P. is dismissed, we feel that in such a situation the applicants may be given one more opportunity to submit their complete representations together with the records of service particulars within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order for consideration of the respondents in terms of the judgment/order dated 1.3.95 in OA 2394/92 and connected cases.

C.P. is disposed of as above.

R.K. Ahuja
(R.K. Ahuja)
Member (A)

sk

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)