

A2
B
1

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH.

.....

Contempt Petition No. 64 of 1995

IN

O.A. No. 88 Of 1993

Dated: 30.8.1995

Hon. Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, V.C.
Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, A.M.

1. Raj Kumar Mishra Son of Sri Tej Prakash Misra, R/o 317/8, Nanak Ganj Sipri Bazar Jhansi.
2. Brijendra Kumar Agrawal, S/o Sri Moham Lal Agrawal, R/o 1401, Refugee Colony, Sipri Bazar, Jhansi.
3. Parveen Kumar Verma, son of Sri V.M. Verma, R/o H.No. 542/4(6-1) Dhyam Chand Colony, Sipri Bazar, Jhansi.
4. Sudhir Kumar Chaurasia, S/o Sri R.S. Chaurasia, R/o H. No.903, Isai Tola, Khalilabad, Jhansi.
5. Sanjay Kumar Dubey, son of Sri Mahesh Prasad Dubey, R/o Pyarelal Ka Hata, Nagra Jhansi.
6. Bhagwandas, son of Tuda Ram R/o 242/D Isai Tola, Nagra, Jhansi.
7. Mohd. Bilal Ali, son of Sri Bahadur Ali, R/o 73 Gandhinagar, Tapra, Jhansi.
8. Ram Charan Rajpali, son of Halkai Rajpali, R/o Vill. Vaswan P.O. Jugbhai, Distt. Tikamgarh, (M.P.).
9. Raghvendra Kumar Khare, son of Narayan Das Khare, R/o T/P Baragaon, Jhansi.

4
A2
2
.2.

10. Bihari Lal Carpenter, S/o Lukhai
Lal, R/o Vill and Post Teharka,
Distt. Tikamgarh, (M.P.) PETITIONERS.

(By Advocate Sri R.K. Nigam)

VERSUS

Sri S.R. Moon, Chief Work Shop
Manager, Central Railway Workshop
Jhansi. OPP. PARTY.

O R D E R (oral)

(By Hon. Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, V.C.)

When the case was called out a request for adjournment was made on behalf of Sri R.K. Nigam, counsel for the petitioners, though Sri Shailendra Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Sri R.K. Nigam on the ground that Sri Nigam is busy in the High Court. The order sheet discloses that on the last three dates which have been fixed in the contempt petition, the learned counsel for the applicant has been sending his illness slip. Since this is a contempt petition and the duty of the applicant ends after he has brought to the notice of the Tribunal the alleged act of the contempt and the ^{subsequent} ~~pendancy~~ of the matter would rest between the Tribunal and the Contemner. We ~~are~~ ^{have} proceeded to go through the contempt application.

2. The applicant had filed O.A. No. 88 of 1993 which was disposed of by an order dated 28.7.1994 passed by this Tribunal. After having gone through the order passed by the Tribunal in the said O.A., we do not find any direction to have been issued to the respondents of which it can be said that there has

5. 3.

been noncompliance. As a matter of fact, in the said judgment, no positive or any direction whatsoever has been issued. The contempt application is totally misconceived and is accordingly dismissed summarily.

W.C.
MEMBER(A),

B.C.D.

VICE-CHAIRMAN.

(N.U.)