



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

**C.P. No. 363/2011  
in  
O.A. No. 1434/2009  
M.A. No. 849/2021  
M.A. No. 850/2021**

**This the 19<sup>th</sup> Day of July, 2021**

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Amar Singh Sharma  
S/o Late Ami Chand Sharma  
R/o 156, Village Sarai Julena  
Okhla Road, New Delhi-110025.

... Petitioner

(By Advocate : Shri Prabhat Kaushik )

**Versus**

Municipal Corporation of Delhi  
(now SDMC), through  
K.S. Mehra, Commissioner MCD  
Civic Center, Minto Road-Delhi

... Respondent

(By Advocate : Shri R.K. Jain )

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

**Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy :**

The applicant filed O.A. No. 1434/2009 challenging the order of punishment dated 28.11.2006, through which penalty of stoppage of three increments with cumulative effect, was imposed. The O.A. was

Item No.3



allowed on 19.03.2010. Aggrieved by that, the respondents filed Writ Petition No.3000/2011 before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. The applicant represented that on account of the punishment, he was released only provisional pension for some time and thereafter regular pension was sanctioned; and that he would be satisfied, in case the arrears of pension are paid. Taking that into account, the Writ Petition was disposed of, through order dated 13.12.2018.

2. This Contempt Petition is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the orders, that were passed in his favour. The respondents filed a compliance affidavit. It is stated that a sum of Rs.5,40,858/- towards difference of pension and a sum of Rs.71,892/- being the difference of leave encashment was paid to the applicant through RTGS.

3. Today, we heard Mr. Prabhat Kaushik, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. R.K. Jain, learned counsel for the respondents.

4. The applicant does not dispute that he received the sums referred to above, being the difference of pension and difference of leave encashment. Though it is urged that the applicant is entitled for the consequential benefits, as directed in the O.A., we find that such a claim is not tenable in view of concession made by him before the Hon'ble High Court.

Item No.3



5. We do not find any contempt in the case and, accordingly, the same is closed. Pending MAs also stand disposed of.

**(A.K. Bishnoi)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

*/jyoti/vb/sd/akshaya/*