

Reserved

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH

ALLAHABAD.

5 of 1994 in

316 of 1992

Date of Decision 21-4-98

Hausila Prasad

Applicant(s)

Sri M.K. Upadhyay
Counsel for the Applicant

Counsel for the
Applicant(s)

VERSUS

Shri Ajay Anjali Kumar Rai 20rs

Respondent(s)

Shri Amit Shetekar

Counsel for the
Respondent(s)

COURT

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal AM

Hon'ble Mr. S.L. Jain JM

1.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?

3. Whether their Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4. Whether to be circulated to all Benches ?



(SIGNATURE)

PIYUSH/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD.

Allahabad this the 21st day of April 1998.

Contempt petition no. 5 of 1994
in

Orbinal Application no. 316 of 1992

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. S.L. Jain, Judicial Member

Hausila Prasad Singh, S/o Shri Haribans Singh,
place of Employment, Senior Divisional personnel
Officer Eastern Railway Mughalsarai, Varanasi

... Applicant.

C/A Shri M.K. Updhayaya

Versus

1. Shri Anjali Kumar Rai, Divisional Railway Manager,
Eastern Railway Mughalsarai, District Varanasi.
2. Shri Sunil Sharma, Senior Divisional personnel Officer,
Eastern Railway Mughalsarai, Distt. Varanasi.

.... Respondents

C/R Shri Amit Sthekar.

O R D E R

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member-A.

This is a petition for contempt filed under
section 17 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 for
wilful disobedience of the direction given by the Tribunal
in judgment dated 17.02.93 in O.A. 316/92.

// 2 //

2. The notices was issued to the respondents to show cause as to why the contempt proceeding should not be initiated against them. The respondents have filed their first counter affidavit on 12.07.94 contesting the claim of the applicant. But no rejoinder affidavit was filed by the learned counsel for the applicant to this C.A.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents filed another counter affidavit on 06.11.95 in which learned counsel for the respondents has claimed that thay have implemented the direction given by the Tribunal in its judgment.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant appeared today and stated at bar that the order of the Tribunal in O.A. 316/92 has been complied with. There is some delay in complying with the order of the Tribunal. However, full compliance of the order has been made. No case survives for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents. Notices issued to them is, therefore, discharged and the case consigned to records.

Swami
Member-J

Shank
Member-A

/pc/