

Open Court

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Allahabad Bench, Allahabad.

Dated: Allahabad, This The 27th Day of March, 2000.

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr. Rafiq Uddin, J.M.

Civil Contempt Application No. 2164 of 1993

in

Original Application No. 463 of 1992.

Arun Kumar Srivastava
aged about 32 years
son of Sri Mata Prasad Srivastava,
resident of 329 Nai Basti,
Jhansi.

. . . Applicant.

Through Sri R.K. Nigam, Adv.

Versus

Sri B.B. Mudgil,
Chairman,
Railway Recruitment Board,
Bombay Central.

. . . Opp. Party.

Through Sri A.K. Gaur, Adv.

Order (Open Court)

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member (A.)


This contempt petition was filed by the
applicant alleging knowing and deliberate violation
of order of this Tribunal dated 9.2.1993 in O.A.
No. 463 of 1992.

2. In a bunch of O.As. including O.A. 463/92

-2-

decided by a common order the respondents were directed to launch an enquiry into the matter associating the applicant with the same and in case no foul play on the part of the applicant was found the applicant should not be deprived of the fruits of ^{his} labour and should be given appointment.


3. The applicant has alleged that a copy of this order was furnished to the respondents and the applicant personally visited the office of opposite party in Bombay but the Opp. party showed no inclination to comply with the directions.


4. Learned counsel for the Opposite party has filed a counter reply in which it has been mentioned that prior to the order of Allahabad Bench in the bunch of cases including that of the applicant the Central Administrative Tribunal Mumbai Bench had disposed of similar cases by order dated 14.2.91 by which they had directed the Railway Administration to appoint a High Powered Committee to scrutinise all cases after giving notice to the affected party and to perform its genuineness about the test etc. The High Powered Committee had scrutinised 693 ^{applicant} candidates including the ~~persons~~ involved in the present case and all were called to appear before the Committee. The committee did not recommend appointment/selection of any of the candidates. Thus the direction to hold an enquiry had been
 been substantially complied with.

-3-

5. The applicant in the present case has not mentioned any of these facts. He has also not mentioned that the respondents had called the applicant before High Powered Committee on 8.7.93 and the applicant had attended.

6. In view of the applicant not stating all ^{the} facts and in view of the enquiry conducted by High Powered Committee we find no disobedience of the order dated 9.2.93 in O.A. 463/92. We, therefore, dismiss the contempt petition and Opp. party stands discharged of the notice given.


Member (J.)


Member (A.)

Nafees.