

(P) (3)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

CP (C) NO. 371/93 & MA NO.  
2898/93 in CA NO. 2083/92

New Delhi this the 17th day of November, 1993.

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN  
THE HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

1. Dr. S. K. Gupta,  
S/O Shri R. D. Gupta,  
Aged 40 years,  
R/O 7/244, Sunder Vihar,  
Delhi-110041.
2. M. Pandey,  
S/O Late Shri B. D. Pandey,  
Aged 35 years,  
R/O F-3/314, Andrews Ganj,  
New Delhi - 110049.
3. M. B. Vasisht,  
S/O Late Shri A. N. Vasisht,  
Aged 48 years,  
R/O GH-14/1047, Paschim Vihar,  
Delhi-110041.
4. R. N. Singh,  
S/O Shri Shiv Charan Lal,  
Aged 41 years,  
R/O RU-66, Pitampura,  
Delhi - 110034. ... Petitioners

By Petitioner No.1 in person

Versus

1. Shri Zafar Saifullah,  
Cabinet Secretary,  
Rashtrapati Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110004.
2. Shri K. Venkatesan,  
Secretary (Expenditure),  
Ministry of Finance,  
North Block,  
New Delhi-110001.
3. Shri N. R. Ranganathan,  
Secretary (Personnel),  
Deptt. of Personnel & Training,  
North Block,  
New Delhi-110001. ... Respondents

✓ By Advocate Shri P. P. Khurana



O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. S. Malimath :-

The complaint in this case is that the directions in O.A. No. 2083/92 dated 16.3.1993 have not been obeyed. The direction in that judgment is that the respondents should secure the report of the Committee to which the relevant question has been referred and to pass final orders within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. The respondents have filed a reply wherein they have stated that what was referred was a similar question in regard to the relief claimed by the Section Officers of the Central Secretariat Service. That question was referred, according to them, to a Committee called Bandopadhyay Committee. As the same principle would be applicable to the petitioners also as their claim being on similar lines, an undertaking was given on behalf of the respondents that they would take a decision on receipt of the said Committee's report and extend the same relief to the petitioners as well. Now the respondents have stated that they have received the copy of the Bandopadhyay Committee report which has stated that it would not be possible for them to make any recommendation which would be at variance with the recommendations with the recommendations made by the 4th Pay Commission. They have, therefore, preferred to say that the matter should more appropriately receive attention



of the next Pay Commission and they have accordingly suggested that the matter be placed in its proper perspective before the next Pay Commission. The respondents' counsel submitted that they have accepted the report of the said Committee and they have taken a decision to place the grievance of the Section Officers of the Central Secretariat Service before the next Pay Commission. The counsel for the respondents also submitted that the grievance of the petitioners shall also be placed before the next Pay Commission for their consideration.

2. From what we have noticed above, it is clear that the respondents have acted in accordance with the undertaking furnished to the Tribunal of securing the report of the Committee and taking a decision thereon. Nothing more was required to be done by the respondents. It is, therefore, not possible to take any action under the Contempt of Courts Act. These proceedings are accordingly dropped.

*S. R. Adige*  
( S. R. Adige )  
Member (A)

*V. S. Malimath*  
( V. S. Malimath )  
Chairman

/as/