

A3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL LUCKNOW BENCH

LUCKNOW

Contempt Petition No. 5/92

in
(O.A.No. 796/88)

Salmanul Haq.....Applicant

Versus

Sri J.K.Puri and another..Respondents.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C.

Hon'ble Mr. K.Obayya, A.M.

(By Mr. Jjstice U.C.Srivastava, V.C.)

The applicant has approached this Tribunal for punishing the respondents who according to him have not complied with the directions given by this Tribunal on the application filed by the applicant registered as O.A.No. 796/88. This Tribunal vide its judgment dated 6.11.91 directed that the respondent to consider his case within a period of 2 months, as to whether he can be appointed again as Khallasi or not. The grievance of the applicant, approached this Tribunal again stating that even though such directions was given but despite service of the same his case was not considered. The respondent in their counter affidavit has stated that the case of the applicant was considered in pursuance of the directions given and it was found that no casual labour junior to him can be retained in service as Khallasi or has been working in postal electrical sub-division. In the supplementary counter affidavit again they have reiterated the same thing. The case of the applicant has been considered, it cannot be said that the order passed by this Tribunal has been disregarded or violated.

W/

Ag

-2-

The contention of the applicant that no communication of the same was given to him cannot evoke contempt jurisdiction that in the counter affidavit averment has been made which also has not been disputed.

Apart from saying that records has been ~~regulated~~ ^{manipulated} which is not very relevant allegation) is not about deciding the application. In view of the fact that the order passed by this Tribunal did ~~not make out~~ ^{with w/v} as disregarded ~~contempt~~ application, accordingly the contempt application is dismissed and the notices are discharged.

R. Bhargava
A.M.

V.C.

Dated: 5.8.92

(AR)