

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

C.P.No.90/2001
in OA-661/2000

25/9/2001

Heard Shri H.K.Hirani, petitioner in person.

2. The Contempt Petition is filed aggrieved by the action of the respondents/alleged contemners has not given personal hearing to the petitioner while disposing of the appeal.

3. In the order of the Tribunal passed on 12/10/2000, the OA was disposed of directing the respondents to dispose of the appeal expeditiously, in any event not beyond four months from the date of the receipt of the order. It is now stated by the petitioner that though the petitioner was heard on disposal of appeal, as he had sought permission to engage a legal counsel, the disposal was postponed but thereafter the petitioner was not given opportunity of hearing before the appeal was disposed of on 20/7/2001.

4. From the above facts we do not find any deliberate violation of the order of the Tribunal. Since the respondents had infact given an opportunity of being heard, the petitioner has not availed of the said offer by putting forth one excuse or other.

5. In the circumstances, we find that there is no *prima facie* case for issuing notice to respondents. The Contempt Petition is therefore dismissed at the time of admission.

Shanta
(SHANTA SHANSTRY)

MEMBER(A)

Om Rajgopal Reddy
(V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY)

VICE CHAIRMAN