

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH

Contempt Petition No.26/2002  
in  
Original Application No.781/2000

Dated this Friday the 5th Day of April, 2002.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Birendra Dikshit, Vice Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri B.N. Bahadur, Member (A).

Laxman Dharwadkar & 7 Others

.. Petitioners  
(Original  
Applicants)

( By Advocate Shri S.S. Karkera )

Versus

1. Shri Yogendra Narayan,  
The Defence Secretary,  
Govt. of India, Ministry of  
Defence, New Delhi-110011.
2. The Signal Officer Incharge,  
O/o The Director General of  
Signals, Sigs. 4(C) Army  
Headquarters, DHQ,P.O.,  
New Delhi-110011.
3. The Commandant, Headquarters,  
Southern Command, Signal Regiment,  
Pune - 1.
4. Shri M.K. Sasidharan,  
Brigadier/Commandant,  
Headquarters, 2, Signal Training  
Centre, Panaji, Goa-403201.

.. Respondents  
(Respondent  
Nos.1 to 4  
are real  
contemnors).

( By Advocate Shri R.R. Shetty )

Order on Contempt Petition (Oral)  
{ Per : Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member (A) }

By order dated 16.3.2001 in O.A.781/2000, this  
Tribunal had directed the respondednts to consider the  
matter within a period of three months from the date of


...2..

A  
✓

receipt of a copy of the order by passing a speaking order, under intimation to the applicants. It has been stated that the matter was under consideration, regarding allowing skilled grade to categories of Boot Repairers/EBRs etc. which were not included in the Government letter sanctioning skilled grade to the Bootmakers. The respondents had sought extension of time to comply with the directions of this Tribunal vide M.P.No.706/2001. Accordingly respondents were granted extension of time upto 31.1.2002 vide order dated 6.11.2001 of this Tribunal. In the meantime, the applicants have filed the present contempt petition on 12.12.2002 for compliance of directions of this Tribunal. The respondents have now produced a Memorandum dated 4.4.2002 across the bar which is the order issued in compliance of the directions of this Tribunal. The respondents have considered the matter and have decided by rejecting the grant of skilled grade to semi skilled category. Thus, we find that though belatedly the respondents have finally complied with the directions of this Tribunal, as such this is not a fit case for imposing any penalty. Accordingly the contempt proceedings are dropped and notices are discharged.

2. The learned Counsel for the applicants further submits that the order passed by the respondents has given a fresh cause of action in that their claim has

...3..



been rejected, this contempt petition cannot<sup>be</sup> used for challenging the order of the respondents passed in compliance of the directions by the Tribunal. If the applicants are aggrieved it would be always open for them to proceed as per rules and law to challenge the order passed by the respondents separately.

*Shanta S*

( Smt. Shanta Shastry )  
Member (A)

*B. Dikshit*

( Birendra Dikshit )  
Vice Chairman.

H.

order/judgement despatched  
to Applicant/Respondent (s)  
on 30.4.2002.

*RP*  
27/4.