

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PATNA BENCH

CCPA NO.: 70 OF 2007

[Arising out of OA 798 of 2005]

[Patna, this Friday, the 26<sup>th</sup> Day of September, 2008]

C O R A M

HON'BLE MS.SADHNA SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER [JUDL.]

HON'BLE MR. AMIT KUSHARI, MEMBER [ADMN.]

.....  
Yogendra Rai,  
S/o Late Bhawani Rai  
& 3 [Three] Ors.

Vs.

Mr. Girish Bhatnagar, General Manager,  
Railway, Hajipur & Ors.

.....  
Counsel for the applicants. :- Shri Pramod Kumar Mishra..

Counsel for the respondents:- Shri Mukund Jee, SC [Res.No.1&3]  
Shri R.N.Choudhary, ASC [Res.No.2&4]

O R D E R [ORAL]

Sadhna Srivastava, M[J] :- This contempt petition has been filed for alleged non compliance of the order dated 20.12.2005, passed in OA 798 of 2005, whereby this Tribunal has directed the respondents no. 2, 3 & 4 to issue duplicate PPO in favour of all four applicants, namely, Yogendra Rai, Ram Grihi Rai, Jai Narayan Rai and Dulari Devi within two months from the date of receipt of that order.

A show cause reply has been filed by the respondent no.2 stating therein that the duplicate PPO dated 29.02.2008 has already been prepared in favour of Yogendra Rai & Ram Grihi Rai and the same are to be issued at the level of FA&CAO, N.E.Railway, Gorakhpur. The counsel for the respondents is unable to give the date when the aforesaid PPO have been issued to the applicants. However, the show cause reply filed on behalf of the respondent no.3 shows that the revised PPO has been issued on 13.06.2006 to Smt. Dulari Devi which was received by her <sup>As applicant No 3</sup> on 23.06.2006 [Annexure-R/A]. In the case of Jai Narayan Rai, Ex-Loco Pilot, the duplicate PPO got prepared and handed over to the Sub-Postmaster, Sub-Post Office at Narawan, Chhapra on 25.01.2008. The applicant, Jai Narayan Rai was ~~wasked~~ to contact the said



post office and collect the said PPO.

In these circumstances, the counsel for the alleged contemners submits that the order passed by this Tribunal has already been complied with and, therefore, this contempt petitioner is liable to be dismissed and notices to be discharged.

In view of above, we are of the opinion that the order passed by this Tribunal has already been complied with. However, liberty is granted to the applicants that if the revised PPOs are not received by them, they may move this Tribunal for revival of this application.

Accordingly, this contempt petition stands disposed of. Notices issued to the respondents stand discharged.

[Amit Kushari]/M[A]

  
skj.

  
[S. Srivastava]/M[J]