

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

C.P. NO. 136/94

in

D.A. NO.1588/92

(21)

New Delhi this the 2nd day of January, 1995

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. K. DHAON, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. B. N. DHOUNDIYAL, MEMBER (A)

1. Suresh S/O Ramesh Chander,
R/O 2-PWD Sewa Kendra,
Police Colony, Ashok Vihar,
Delhi-52.
2. Kartar Singh S/O Hari Chand,
R/O 24 - Gaon Jagat Pura,
Post Buradhia, Delhi-9.
3. Sarat Singh S/O Yogeshwar Singh,
R/O 36/426, Panchkuin Road,
New Delhi. ... Applicants

(By Advocate Shri V. P. Sharma)

Versus

R. P. Tomar,
Director of Census Operations,
Old Secretariat, Delhi. ... Respondent

(By Advocate Shri M. K. Gupta)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice S. K. Dhaon —

The complaint is that the decision given by this Tribunal on 27.5.1993 has not been complied with. This Tribunal had directed the Chief Secretary to decide the question of regularisation of the applicants in their respective services. The Chief Secretary was also required to examine the respective cases of the applicants in accordance with law.


2. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent by Shri Subhash Garg, Deputy Director, Directorate of Census Operations, Delhi. To it, a copy of letter dated 8.11.1994 issued by the Joint

Su

Secretary (Services), has been annexed. A perusal of the said letter indicates that a bona fide attempt has been made to comply with the directions.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants states that the applicants may be given some time to collect the relevant documents so as to enable them (the applicants) to rebut the conclusions arrived at by the Chief Secretary. We feel that such an exercise would not be necessary in so far as the disposal of the contempt application is concerned. What has to be seen by us is whether the respondent is wilfully disobeying the directions of this Tribunal. The detailed letter dated 8.11.1994 indicates that this is not so. If the applicants feel aggrieved by the conclusions arrived at by the Chief Secretary, it is open to them to challenge his conclusions by taking appropriate proceedings in the appropriate forum.

4. The contempt application does not survive. It is accordingly dismissed. Notice issued to the respondent is discharged. There shall be no orders as to costs.


(B. N. Dhoundiyal)
Member (A)


(S. K. Dhaon)
Vice Chairman

/as/