

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH
LUCKNOW**

C. C. P. No.38/2010

In

Original Application No. 594/2005

Lucknow this the 31st day of July, 2014.

HON'BLE MR. NAVNEET KUMAR MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MS. JAYATI CHANDRA, MEMBER (A)

Satya Prakash , aged about 67 years, son of Late Brij Mohan Lal Srivastava, resident of C-12/2 Kailash Puri , Alambagh, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate: None.

Versus

1. Anil Kumar Purwar, the Chief General Manager, (R) Telecommunication, U.P. Circle, (East), Lucknow.
2. Sunil Kumar Parihar, Principal General Manager (P), Telecommunication, Gandhi Bhawan, Lucknow.
3. U.K. Mishra, Chief Superintendent, Central Telegraph Office, Lucknow.
4. Rajiv Chandel, Additional General Manager(A) in the office of Chief General Manage, U.P. East, Telecommunication Circle, Lucknow.

Respondents

By Advocate Sri G. S. Sikarwar.

ORDER(ORAL)

By Hon'ble Mr. Navneet Kumar, Member (J)

The present Contempt Petition is preferred by the applicant for non compliance of order dated 8th of February, 2010 passed in O.A. No. 594 of 2005 through which the Tribunal passed the order which reads as under:

"Resultantly, all the three O.As succeed and are allowed. The impugned orders dated 5/16.9.2002 and 22.11.2002 are set aside. The respondents are directed to release the aforementioned amount recovered from the DCRG along with interest @ 6 % per annum from the date of filing of O.A.s till the date of actual payment. However, this decision shall be subject to final outcome of SLP, if any, pending before the Supreme Court. No costs."

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has pointed out that the recovered amount amounting to Rs. 49,631/- was refunded to the applicant as per the letter dated 5.3.2014 as contained in Annexure 4 to the compliance report

W~

and the interest @ 6 % PA was also paid through Cheque No. 433600/- amounting of Rs. 24907/- dated 1st of July 2014. As such, it is pointed out by the respondents that the order passed by the Tribunal has been fully complied with and nothing survives to be adjudicated in the present contempt petition.

3. It is also seen from the record that no one was present on behalf of the applicant on the last occasion as well. As such, it appears that the applicant has lost interest in the present contempt petition. As per the statement given by the learned counsel for the respondents, the compliance has already been made, as such, nothing survives to be adjudicated in the present contempt petition.

4. Accordingly, the contempt petition is dismissed. Notices issued to the respondents stands discharged.

J. Chandra

(Ms. Jayati Chandra)
Member (A)

V.R. Agrawal
(Navneet Kumar)
Member (J)

vidya