

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

C.A.No. 9 OF 1993

in

O.A. NO. 386 OF 1991

~~Texxx No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 12-6-1995

Hemubhai Kanabhai Chauhan, **Petitioner**

Mr. P.H. Pathak, **Advocate for the Petitioner (s)**

Versus

Chief Postmaster General & Anrs. **Respondents**

Mr. Akil Kureishi, **Advocate for the Respondent (s)**

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel, Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. K. Ramamoorthy, Admn. Member.

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 ?

✓N

Hemubhai Kanabhai Chauhan,
at: Ved, Ta. Sami,
Dist: Mehsana.

.... Applicant.

(Advocate: Mr.P.H. Pathak)

Versus.

1. Shri Balaguru Saheb,
Chief Postmaster General
or his successor in office
Gujarat Circle, Ahmedabad.

2. Shri U.C. Mansuri,
Superintendent of Post Office
or his successor in office
Patan Division, Patan.

Respondents.

(Advocate: Mr. Akil Kureishi)

ORAL ORDER

C.A.No. 9 OF 1993

in

O.A.No. 386 OF 1991

Date: 12.6.1995.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel, Vice Chairman.

It is stated that the judgment in question is complied, though not within the stipulated time. However, taking over^{all} all view of these circumstances, we are inclined to think that there is no wilful default or disobedience. Contempt proceedings are, therefore, closed and notice is discharged. In case of any difficulty, the applicant will have liberty to ask for revival of the Contempt Application. No costs.



(K.Ramamoorthy)
Member(A)



(N.B. Patel)
Vice Chairman

vtc.