

(16)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH**

C.P.279/98 in  
O.A.No.2208/92

New Delhi, this the 23rd day of November, 1998

**HON'BLE SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)**  
**HON'BLE MR. N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)**

1. Shri Singh Raj son of Shri Roop Chand,  
employed as Lab. Attendant,  
resident of Village Badrola,  
P.O. Tigaon Distt. Faridabad.

2. Shri Digamber Singh son of Shri Gaddarmal Singh,  
employed as Lab. Attendant,  
r/o Village Pengaltu,  
P.O. Hodal, Distt. Faridabad.

....Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri Sant Lal)

versus

1. Shri Kamal Pandey,  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India,  
Krishi Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110001.

2. Dr. N. Tripathi,  
Director,  
Central Fertilizer Quality Control  
and Training Institute,  
National Highway-4,  
Faridabad (Haryana).

....Respondents

(By Advocate: None)

**O R D E R (ORAL)**

**HON'BLE SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)**

Heard Shri Sant Lal, ld counsel for applicant.

2. Shri Sant Lal submits that C.P.279/98 was  
filed on 25.8.98 claiming that the respondents have  
wilfully disobeyed the directions of the Tribunal in the  
order dated 18.9.97 in O.A.2208/92. In the meantime,  
ld. counsel states that the respondents have issued  
office order no.89/98 dated 20.10.98 which is in

js

17

compliance of the aforesaid order of the Tribunal. However, he submits that the consequential benefits which are to be paid to the applicants, have still not been paid.

3. We note that no notice on C.P. has been issued so far. It is further noted from paragraph 3 of the office order no.89/98 dated 20.10.98 that all consequential benefits w.e.f. <sup>the 13.</sup> respective dates will follow. This order has been passed in pursuance of the Tribunal's order dated 18.9.97 in OA-2208/92. A copy of the office order is placed on record.

4. In the facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the view that this C.P. is not maintainable as there is no wilful disobedience of the Tribunal's order dated 18.9.97.

5. Ld. counsel for applicant states that further direction may be given to the respondents to pay the consequential benefits in accordance with paragraph 3 of the office order passed by the respondents. We have no reason to believe that consequential benefits will not be paid. It is presumed that respondents shall pay all consequential benefits to the applicants in pursuance of the order dated 20.10.98, shortly.

6. With this, C.P.279/98 in O.A.2208/92 is dismissed as having become infructuous.

*N. Sahu*  
( N. Sahu )  
Member (A)

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

/dinesh/