

Item No.1



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

**C.P. No. 173/2021
In
O.A. No. 2183/2020**

This the 20th Day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Dr. Krishan Chandra, Group -A,
Aged about 59 years,
S/o Late Sh. P.Pal,
R/o B-240, Priyadarshini Vihar,
Kanha Apartment, New Delhi - 110011.
Posted as Director,
National Centre for Organic Farming,
Ghaziabad, U.P., in INM Division,
Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Welfare,
Govt. of India, Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi - 110001

... Petitioner

(By Advocate : Shri Umesh Singh)

Versus

Sanjay Agarwal,
The Secretary (A&FW)
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi - 110001

... Respondent

(By Advocate : Shri H.K. Gangwani)

**O R D E R (ORAL)****Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

The applicant filed OA No.451/2020, challenging the order of transfer and OA No.2183/2020, challenging the order of suspension and initiation of disciplinary proceedings. Through a common order dated 08.03.2021, the Tribunal dismissed the first OA. The second OA was disposed of directing that the disciplinary proceedings shall be concluded within a period of five months, and that as and when the matter relating to extension of suspension is taken up, the representation of the applicant shall be kept in view. This contempt case is filed alleging that despite the specific direction in the OA No.2182/2020, the respondents extended his suspension vide order dated 25.06.2021, without making a reference to the order at all.

2. We heard Shri Umesh Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Ranjan Tyagi, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. The respondents considered the case of the applicant for extension of suspension on expiry of 90 days. The direction was to take the representation made by the applicant into account, while taking a decision, as regard the extension.

Item No.1



The respondents passed order dated 25.06.2021, considering the representation of the applicant. It is clearly mentioned that the matter was reviewed and there is nothing to believe that the direction issued by this Tribunal was not taken into account. It is purely discretionary and we do not find any contempt on the part of the respondents.

4. The CP is accordingly closed.

(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/sd/rk/ns/akshaya/