



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**C.P. No./100/97/2021  
O.A. No./100/2397/2019**

**This the 6<sup>th</sup> Day of April, 2021**

Through Video Conferencing

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

Santosh Kumar Parashar  
(Retd. Executive Engineer (Civil) Group A,  
S/o. Late Sh. B. R. Parashar, Flat No. L-304,  
The Golden Palms, Sector-168, Gautam Buddha Nagar,  
UP - 201 305. ...Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mr. G. L. Verma)

Versus

1. Sh. Anurag Jain, IAS,  
Vice Chairman, DDA, VikasSadan,  
New Delhi - 110 023.  
Email : [vcdda@dda.org.in](mailto:vcdda@dda.org.in)
2. Sh. D. Sarkar  
Commissioner Personnel, DDA  
VikasSadan, INA New Delhi - 110 023.  
Email : [d.sarkar416@dda.gov.in](mailto:d.sarkar416@dda.gov.in)
3. Ms. NimishaJha  
Chief Accounts Officer, DDA  
VikasSadan, New Delhi - 110 023.  
Email : [nimisha.jha@gov.in](mailto:nimisha.jha@gov.in)
4. Sh. Rakesh Kumar,  
Dy. Director (P)-1  
Room No. B-311,  
VikasSadan, INA New Delhi - 110 023.  
Email : [rakjesh.kum348@dda.gov.in](mailto:rakjesh.kum348@dda.gov.in) ... Respondent

(By Advocate :Mr. Upjeet Singh)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

This contempt petition is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the order dated 02.11.2020 in OA No. 2397/2019. The OA was allowed and the order impugned was set aside. However, it was left open to the respondents to issue notice to the applicant and to pass orders. Further observation was that, in case no notice is issued within four weeks from the date of receipt of the order, the entire retirement benefits shall be released to the applicant.

2. In the contempt case, it is contended that the respondents did not implement the order. However, from a perusal of the order dated 09.03.2021, filed as Annexure CP-3, it is evident that the respondents had sent a notice to the applicant on 23.11.2020, proposing to revise 2<sup>nd</sup> ACP and 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP and for recovery of Rs.24,96,769/-. It was mentioned that the notice was returned, without service though it was sent through speed post. Across the Bar, this factum was mentioned that notice was sent to the advocate on their behalf. In the order dated 09.03.2021, the respondents have categorically mentioned the fact that the notice was issued.

3. We do not find any reason to proceed with the Contempt case. The contempt case is accordingly closed.

(Pradeep Kumar)  
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)  
Chairman

/s/L.Narasi/mbt/ns