

OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH

ALLAHABAD

Allahabad : Dated this 16th day of August, 2000
civil misc. contempt Petition No. 75 of 1999

In

Original Application No. 608 of 1996

District : Agra

CORAM :-

Hon'ble Mr. Rafiquddin, J.M.

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

Anil Kumar Dixit Son of Viswambher Dayal Sharma,

C/o Shri Rakesh Kumar Sharma,

R/o House No.19/292, Near Dauji Mandir, Jain

Street, Chhespi Tola, Agra.

(Sri MK Upadhyay, Advocate)

. Applicant

Versus

1. Sri R.A.U. Prasad,
Secretary of Ministry of Communication,
Department of Post, Dak Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Shri S.P. Ujha, Chief Post Master General,
Uttar Pradesh Circle, Lucknow.
3. Shri G. Lal, The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Mainpuri, Division, Mainpuri.
(Kmi Sadhna Srivastava, Advocate)

. Opp. Parties

- 2 -

O R D E R (O r a l)

By Hon'ble Mr. Rafiquddin, J.M.

This contempt petition has been moved by the applicant for punishing the respondents under Contempt of Courts Act for non-compliance of the order dated 9-12-1998 passed by this Tribunal in OA No.608/1996.

2. This Tribunal vide order dated 9-12-1998 directed the opp. parties to declare the result of the applicant and in case the applicant has succeeded in the examination for the post of Postal Assistant, the case for granting him relaxation from the limit of maximum age stipulated in the rule be considered by the respondents as per the special circumstances of this case.

3. The respondents in their counter affidavit vide Para 4 have clearly stated that on receipt of the copy of the judgement the case was examined and the matter was referred to the Directorate and as a result relaxation of one day limit had been granted by the Department of Personnel and Training on 24-10-1999 and result of the applicant has also been declared on 07-1-2000. The applicant has not disputed these facts by filing any rejoinder affidavit. Learned counsel for the applicant has no doubt stated that after declaration of the result the applicant has not been given any appointment but we find that there was no direction issued by this Tribunal in the order in question for appointment of the applicant. Therefore, we find that the compliance of the order of the Tribunal has been carried out by the respondents and, therefore, no case for contempt of Court is made out. The contempt petition is, therefore, dismissed.

Notices issued to the respondents are also discharged.

Dube/

Member (A)

Rafiquddin
Member (J)