

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

(10)

**Q.A.NO.** CA/06/94 in OA/476/89  
**T.A.NO.**

**DATE OF DECISION** 5.02.1996

Jeram Mohan

**Petitioner**

Mr.G.A.Pandit

**Advocate for the Petitioner (s)**

**Versus**

The union of India & Ors.

**Respondent**

Mr.R.M.Vin

**Advocate for the Respondent (s)**

**CORAM**

**The Hon'ble Mr. K.Ramamoorthy :** Member (A)

**The Hon'ble Mr.**

**JUDGMENT**

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

W

11

Jeram Mohan  
Khalasi, Under LOCO,  
Forman, Botad,  
BHAVNAGAR

.... Applicant

(Advocate : Mr.G.A.Pandit )

Versus

1. The Union of India, through,  
the General Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Churchgate, BOMBAY.

2. Shri Ashokkumar N.Chopra,  
Divisional Railway Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Bhavnagar Para, BHAVNAGAR

.... Respondents

(Advocate : Mr.R.M.Vin )

O R A L L - O R D E R

Date : 5.02.96

In

CA/06/94 in OA/476/89

Per : Hon'ble Shri K.Ramamoorthy : Member (A)

Both the learned counsel are not present. However, on perusal of the reply given by the respondents and also the further rejoinder filed by the applicant, it is obvious that the respondents have disposed of the representation by order of 31.5.1991. It is obvious that the applicant has given the application more by way of his dissatisfaction with complying order passed by the D.R.M's office, Bhavnagar.

This is a contempt application for not having implemented the order of 31.1.1992. We do not see any merits in the petition as such since the representation has been disposed of by D.R.M's office dated 14.5.1993. It is, therefore, clear that there is no wilful disobedience in carrying out the order of this Tribunal. Hence, contempt notice is discharged. No order as to costs.

  
( K. Ramamoorthy )

Member (A)

Date	Office Report	ORDER
30.7.96		<p style="text-align: right;">(P)</p> <p>As regards filing of V.P., objection is already over ruled.</p> <p>As regards other remaining office objections, Mr.Pavankumar will remove the same within three days.</p> <p>Adjourned to 2nd August, 1996.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">npm</p>
31.7.96	<p><u>RJ Submitted</u></p> <p>objections have been complied with today.</p> <p>01/8/96 8/8/96 SPLS</p>	
2.8.96		<p>Adjourned to 8.8.1996, for removal of office objections. <del>No further time will be given.</del></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p>
3.8.96	<p>nobody has come to comply with the objection never given. It has also been removed. No order is placed on the matter.</p> <p>Adjourned on 14-8-96 in business</p>	<p>As regards filing of V.P. the objection is already over ruled on 30.7.96.</p> <p>Other remaining office objections will be removed by the counsel for the applicant within seven days.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">npm</p>

Date	Office Report	ORDER
14.8.96		<p><u>MAST/354/96</u></p> <p>Objections in MAST is ordered to be overruled.</p> <p>MA ST be registered as M.A.</p> <p><u>CA/6/94 in OA/476/89</u></p> <p>Registry to fix the date of hearing after giving regular number of MA.</p> <p><i>hyun</i> ( T.N. Bhat ) Member (J)</p> <p><i>R</i> (K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p>
30.8.96		<p>Mr.Vin sought leave of absence. Adjourned to 10.9.96</p> <p><i>hyun</i> ( T.N. Bhat ) Member (J)</p> <p><i>R</i> (K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p> <p>npm</p>
10.9.96		<p>Fresh notice may be issued to the applicant in view of the demise of Shri G.A.Pandit.</p> <p>Adjourned to 8th October, 1996.</p> <p><i>R</i> ( K.Ramamoorthy ) Member (A)</p> <p>npm</p>
		<p>REASON FOR DEFERRED</p>

Date	Office Report	ORDER
8.10.96		<p><u>MA/572/96</u></p> <p>The applicant prays for restoration of ex-parte order dated 5.2.1996. We have seen from the order dated 5.2.96 that according to the judgment there was no basis for contempt as there was no disobedience in carrying out the order of this Tribunal. Accordingly, C.A. was disposed of. If the applicant has any grievance regarding the decision taken by the respondents, he has other legal remedies like filing of fresh O.A. In any case he cannot file a contempt petition.</p> <p>Accordingly, there is no merit in the prayer for restoration of the <del>exx</del>.C.A., MA/572/96 is rejected.</p> <p><u>MA/580/96</u></p> <p>M.A. for condonation of delay and restoration also stands rejected in view of the rejection of MA/572/96.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>[Signature]</i> ( V.Radhakrishnan ) Member (A)</p> <p>npm</p>