

Bewa Kothi, Leader Road, Allahabad.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Wasibuzzaman, General Manager, N. Rly, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. R.D. Tripathi, Senior Divisional Commercial Superintendent, Northern Railway, Allahabad.
3. A.K. Jain Divisional Railway Manager, N. Rly, Allahabad.

... Respondents

12. Contempt Application no. 2106 of 1993  
in Original Application no. 1642 of 1992.

Mr. Sujata Dhusia, D/o Late Shri R.A. Dhusia, 20, Sadar Bazar (New Dant), Allahabad.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri S.N. Mathur, General Manager, N. Rly, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. Shri A.K. Jain, Divisional Railway Manager, N. Rly Allahabad.
3. Shri R.D. Tripathi, Sr. Divisional Commercial Manager, DRM Office, N. Rly, Allahabad.

... Respondents

13. Contempt Application no. 23 of 1994  
Original Application no. 826 of 1991

Rafiqat Hussain Rizvi, S/o Late Shri S.H. Rizvi, R/o 5 Sultampur Bhawa, Allahabad.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri Mansiulzaman, General Manager, Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.

Bch

Cont.....6/-

- 2- Shri A.K. Jain, Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Allahabad.  
3- Shri R.D. Tripathi, Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, Northern Railway, DRM Office, Allahabad.

... Respondents

14. Contempt Application no. 925 of 1993  
Original Application no. 1221 of 1991.

Rakesh Mehta, S/o Shri D.S. Mehta, R/o Railway Quarter No.65 FF, VII-Avenue, Nawab Yusuf Road, Allahabad.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri S.N. Mathur, General Manager, Northern Railway Baroda House, New Delhi. (Representing the Union of India).  
2. Shri A.K. Jain, The Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Allahabad.

... Respondents

15. Contempt Petition no. 1496 of 1992  
Original Application no. 1229 of 1991.

Ashfaq Ali, S/o Shri Ahmed Ali, a/a 30 Years, R/o 272-Chak Zero Road, Allahabad.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri P.K. Wahi, Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, DRM Office, Nawab Yusuf Road, Allahabad.  
2. Shri Ram Payere, Senior Divisional Commercial Superintendent, Northern Railway, D.R.M. Office, Nawab Yusuf Road, Allahabad.

... Respondents

PSH

O A D E R (Reserved)

JUSTICE B.C. SARKAR, V.C.

The learned counsel for the applicants of these bunch of 15 contempt petitions stated that the various O.A.s out of which these contempt applications arise, the Tribunal had passed identical orders as in O.A. 131/92 Lalji Shukla Vs. Union of India and Ors out of which the leading contempt petition no. 2426/93 arises. We are, therefore proceeding to decide all these 15 contempt petitions by a common judgment.

2. In these contempt petitions it is alleged that ~~they were~~ in various O.A.s out of which these contempt petitions arise, a Division Bench of this Tribunal passed orders directing the respondents "to consider and analyse the cases of Mobile Ticket Collectors and to find out if any scheme can be framed by them by laying down a particular criteria for re-engaging them as casual or daily basis. Let a scheme be framed ~~within~~ a period of two months from the date of communication of this order".

3. It is alleged by the applicants that in pursuance to the directions they approached the respondents for their re-engagement, they have not been re-engaged. The specific grievance of the applicants is that the respondents though directed specifically by the orders contained in the O.A.s to frame a scheme by laying down criteria for re-engaging them as casual or daily basis have failed to frame such a scheme.

4. The respondents filed application under Rule 24 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules 1987 and have indicated that

*Recd*

...pg

after the decision in U.A. 131/92 Lalji Shukla Vs. Union of India and Ors (i.e. to say the leading case), the respondents at the stage of Divisional Railway Manager Northern Railway Allahabad requested the General Manager Northern Railway Baroda House New Delhi to consider feasibility of framing of a scheme as directed by the Tribunal. In response thereto the Chief Commercial Manager (General) Northern Railway New Delhi passed an order on the 25th of October 1993 suggesting that it was not feasible to frame the scheme. The matter was referred upto the stage of Railway Board and a special leave petition was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The further averment on behalf of the respondents is that the apex court by an order dated 7.4.94 passed the following order:-

" Delay condoned. The order only gives the direction to the petitioner to find out if any scheme can be framed out. The Union of India can examine the matter and if it is not possible to frame a scheme record its finding accordingly. There is no obligation cast by the impugned order that the scheme should be framed in any case. Subject to the above observations the SLP is disposed of. "

5. The copy of the communication by the General Manager (Commercial) dated 12.5.94 has also been annexed along with copy of the letter dated 26.5.94 passed by the General Manager. Through the last letter the decision of the Railway Board contained in its letter dated 26.5.94

has been reproduced. The Railway Board had passed the following order:-

" the feasibility of working of a scheme for re-engagement of the voluntary Ticket Collectors has been examined by the Board and has directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in their judgment dated 7.4.94 and it has been decided that in view of the decision explained in General Manager (Commercial) New Delhi's note dated 25.10.93 attached to the letter referred to above and also in view of the fact that the Railway beset with the problems of absorption of a large number of surplus employees and casual labourers, it will not be possible to device a scheme for re-engagement of the voluntary ticket collectors who were engaged only for a short period on payment of Pocket Allowance Basis. The case of the voluntary Ticket collectors also bear no analogy with the case of Mobile Booking Clerks for whom a special scheme was worked out for their re-engagement "

6. The direction to the respondents as given in the order passed by the Tribunal in the various U.A.s shows that the respondents were only required to consider and analyse the cases of Mobile Ticket Collectors and find out if any scheme can be framed by laying down a particular criteria for re-engaging them for casual

BoL

...pic

or daily basis. The said direction as would be evident from the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court while disposing of the SLPs against the said order did not cast any obligation on the respondents to frame such a scheme. The Supreme court therefore indicated that the Union of India can examine the matter and it is not possible to frame a scheme record its findings accordingly.

7. As noted hereinabove, the Union of India through its various officers at different level considered the feasibility of drawing a scheme for re-engagement of Mobile Ticket Collectors. The reasons indicated in the various communications annexed alongwith the application filed by the respondents have not been challenged before us nor they could have been challenged in these contempt proceedings. We are, therefore not required to indicate the said reasons nor to analyse the correctness of the said reasons. The respondents were only directed to consider and analyse, thus in a way to consider the feasibility of drawing up a scheme. The respondents have considered the feasibility and have indicated reasons why drawing up of such a scheme was not feasible. In these facts, we are not impressed with the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicants that the respondents have wilfully disobeyed to draw up a scheme as per the directions given while deciding the various O.A.s. The contempt petition lack merit and are accordingly dismissed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

SA  
Member (M)  
Dated: January 23, 1995

SA  
Vice Chairman

Uv/

Photo copy  
8-2-95