•			:			
* .					•	
	•					
,* •				•	6	
	• •	יום מונים מיי	ADA		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	*			MINISTRATIVE ALLAHABAD	TRIBUNAL	
	CCA 330	193	THE PLANT OF	. THE COUNTY		
				Section 1		. ,
•		ን 3 6 of 19 % ጊ		F DECISION :		
· .					0	
		Dawerska Pro	apar.	-APPLICANT	4 S)	
	CM &	m K.s. Rat	home			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			ADVOCAT	E FOR THE	
		•		APPL1 CAN	NT(S)	
	•	VER	sus			, i .
	Q _ 1/			ala balli		
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	N NO K	imas (19.4)) M-Kry.	NEW - RESPONDEN	T(3)	
	4R -			**************************************	. (3)	
				- ADVOGATE C		
	•			RESPONDENT		
,	CQRAM			· ·		
	The Hon'ble	mr. Justice	B.C.80	Keenadic	•	. 1
		Mr. S.Das G				
\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\				Limmon		
$\epsilon = \epsilon$	1. Whether	Reporters of	local pap	ers may be a	allowed to	
	see the	judgment?				· ·
	A control of the cont	eferred to the	1 .			. ,
	3. Whether	their Lordship	ps wish to	ວ see th e f්z	$\mathbf{i}\mathbf{r}$ $\mathbf{\infty}$ py	
		• •		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· 1
	4. Whether	to be circula	ted to al!	Lother Benc	ch ?	• •
1			• •	Roll	1	
· · · · ·			$ \cdot $	(SIGNATURE)		•
<u>.</u>	VKP/-	•		STAMMINUTY.		
				•	N.	
*						
		* ·				
					4	
					The second secon	•
				. 49	•	
				•	·.	
	•					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			*		
			,	• .		

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH ALLAHABAD.

Contempt Petition No. 330 of 1993
In

Original Application No.336 of 1992

Allahabad this the 24th day of November 1995

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, Vice Chairman Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member (Administrative)

Dawarka Prasad S/o Ram Gulam, R/o 140, hajrooppur, Allahabad.

APPLICANT.

By Advocate: Shri K.S. Rathore.

Versus

 Raj Kumar (General Manager), Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.

HESPONDENT .

By Advocate ----

×

ORD ER(oral)

By Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, V.C.

has not responded when the case was called out.

The applicant through this Contempt Petition

alleges that the respondent has committee

contempt by wilful disobedience of the decision

given by the Tribunal in its order dated 03.7.92

in 0.A.336 of 1992. From the order-sheet, we

Rook

the respondents to show-cause as to why the contempt petition be not admitted and contempt proceedings may not be initiated against the contemner. This order does not amount to the initiation of the contempt proceedings. Since more than I year has elapsed from the date of alleged contempt, In view of the provision of Section 20 of Contempt of Court's Act, it is not possible to take cognizance of the contempt petition at this stage. The contempt petition is dismissed summarily. The notice issued to the respondent is hereby discharged.

Member (A)

Vice Chairman

/M·M