

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH

---

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 376 OF 1987.

Date of decision ... December 17, 1987.

Birendra Chandra Behera, son of Khetamohan Behera,  
At, P.O. Goudadiha, Dist- Mayurbhanj.

... Applicant.

V e r s u s

1. Union of India,  
represented by the Secretary,  
Dak Bhavan, New Delhi.
  2. The Postmaster General,  
Orissa Circle,  
At, P.O. Bhubaneswar,  
Dist- Puri.
  3. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Mayurbhanj, At/P.O. Baripada,  
Dist- Mayurbhanj. ... Respondents.
- 

M/s R.N.Naik & R.N.Hota, ... For Applicant.  
Advocates

Mr. Tahali Dalai, Addl. Standing ... For Respondents.  
Counsel ( Central)

---

C O R A M :

THE HON'BLE MR. B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

THE HON'BLE MR. K.P.ACHARYA, MEMBER ( JUDICIAL)

---

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be  
allowed to see the judgment ? Yes .
  2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ? No .
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the  
fair copy of the judgment ? Yes.
-

J U D G M E N T

K.P.ACHARYA, MEMBER (J), In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the grievance of the applicant is that the direction given by this Bench in Original Application No. 49 of 1987 has not yet been given effect to because ~~the~~ time limit has not been fixed to give effect to the judgment.

2. We have heard Mr. Naik, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Tahali Dalai, learned Addl. Standing Counsel (Central) for the respondents at some length. Shortly stated the case of the petitioner is that his services were terminated by the Postal Department and being aggrieved by the termination order, the petitioner had invoked the jurisdiction of this Bench which formed the subject-matter of O.A. No. 49 of 1987. The said case was heard on merits and by our judgment dated 31st August 1987 we have allowed the application setting aside the termination order and we have further directed that the petitioner should be re-instated into service forth-with.

3. Mr. Naik, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted before us that despite the fact that this Bench had directed the Postal Department to forthwith reinstate the petitioner and despite lapse of about three months, no steps have been taken as yet by the departmental authorities. We agree with the submissions made by Mr. Naik that 'forth with' cannot include a period of three months. However, for the present

we are prepared to take a lenient view in the matter without taking recourse to initiation of a proceeding for contempt etc. as we hope and trust the competent authority would immediately pay his attention to this matter. We would direct that within a month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment, the order passed by us in Original Application No. 49 of 1987 should be given effect to.

4. Thus, the application stands allowed leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

*[Signature]*  
17.12.87.  
.....  
Member (Judicial)

B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN,

*g agree.*



*[Signature]*  
17.12.87.  
.....  
Vice Chairman.

Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Cuttack Bench.  
December 17, 1987/Roy SPA.