

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD.

Allahabad this the 18th day of December 2000.

Contempt Application no. 71 of 2000  
in  
Original Application no. 204 of 1992.

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Administrative Member  
Hon'ble Mr. Rafiq Uddin, Judicial Member

Chedi Lal, S/o Shri Bhagole,  
R/o Village and Post Amra, Tahsil Moth,  
Distt. Jhansi (UP) lastly working as monthly  
Rated Casual Labour at Kailaras Railway  
Station, Central Railway.

... Applicant

C/A Shri A.K. Dave

Versus

1. K.B. Shankaran, General Manager,  
Central Railway, C.S.T. Mumbai.
2. A.K. Gupta, Divisional Railway Manager,  
Central Railway, Jhansi.

... Respondents

C/Rs Sri P. Mathur

O R D E R (Oral)

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member-A.

This contempt application has been filed  
for taking action against the opposite parties for

...2/-

for wilful disobedience of the direction of the Tribunal in OA 204 of 1992 dated 7.3.2000 by which the opposite parties were directed to engage the applicant as casual labour initially in ~~his~~<sup>his</sup> turn and later on regularise him on the vacancy from the date any person junior to him has been engaged. Respondents were also asked to inform as to how many persons in the list of seasonal waterman mentioned by Commercial Department had been engaged till now with their serial number in the list.

2. We have heard the arguments of learned counsel for the parties.


3. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that persons junior to the applicant whose names were mentioned in the OA had not been considered in passing the order dated 20.6.2000 of compliance (annexure CA-3). He argues that he had mentioned the names and the respondents had not produced the record of the persons whose names were mentioned as junior to the applicant in the OA and further names as added in the RA.


4. We find from the order dated 7.3.2000 that the applicant had claimed that certain persons who were engaged later had been considered for regular absorption, while the applicant was not considered. The respondents in their order dated 20.06.2000 have stated that no seasonal waterman has been engaged after 1994 and that 57 watermans were engaged in 1992, 26 watermans were engaged in 1993 and 26 watermans were engaged in 1994.

// 3 //

They have categorically stated that no persons junior to the applicant had been engaged in the waterman capacity till date. The applicant's names stood at sl. no. 94 which has been observed by the Division Bench in its order dated 7.3.2000.

5. In view of the facts given in the order dated 20.06.2000 (annexure A-3). We do not find that there is any contempt of the order of the Tribunal. The case for contempt is dropped. Notices issued are discharged.

  
Member-J

  
Member-A

/pc/