

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH

Dated this Friday the 1st November, 2002

Coram: Hon'ble Mr.B.N.Bahadur - Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr.S.L.Jain - Member (J)

C.P.62 OF 2002  
in  
O.A.No.900 of 2001

Mrs.Bhagirathi Kadam,  
aged about 43 yrs,  
R/o C/o Shri Yuvraj Kadam,  
Bhise Patil's Wada,  
behind Yogeshwari High School,  
Ambejogai Taluka , Ambejogai,  
District Beed.

- Contempt Petitioners

Versus

1. Union of India  
through the Director,  
Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti,  
Ministry of Manpower Development,  
Education Department,  
Indira Gandhi Stadium, IP Estate,  
New Delhi - 10 002.
2. The Deputy Director,  
Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti,  
78, Mayur Colony, Kothrud,  
Pune.
3. The Incharge Principal,  
Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya,  
Gondia, Bhandara.
4. Shri V.Ramarao,  
Director,  
Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti,  
Ministry of Manpower Development  
Education Department,  
Indira Gandhi Stadium, IP Estate,  
New Delhi - 110 002.
5. Smt.Sudha Sharma,  
Deputy Director of Navodaya  
Vidyalaya Samiti, Pune,  
78 Mayur Colony, Kothrud,Pune.
6. Shri Ramatkar,  
Incharge Principal,  
Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya,  
Gondia, District Bhandara. - Contemnors

ORAL ORDER

By Hon'ble Mr.B.N.Bahadur, Member (A) -

This Contempt Petition is filed by the Applicant in OA 900  
of 2001 (Mrs.Bhagirathi Kadam Vs. Union of India & another)  
decided on 27.3.2001.



2. Perused the papers in Contempt Petition. On an earlier occasion i.e. on 18.10.2002, counsel for the petitioner was present. However, when the case was called out yesterday, 31.10.2002, none was present. Today also none is present. We have therefore heard Shri V.S.Masurkar, learned counsel for Contemnors/Respondents and have seen the reply filed by the alleged contemnors.

3. With reference to the orders made in the OA, the Director of the Navodaya Vidhyalaya Samiti has himself made an Office Order dated 17.10.2002, a copy of which is appended with the Additional Statement filed by the official respondents. We have carefully gone through the order. It recounts all the facts and shows that a decision has been taken by the Commissioner after application of mind. It cannot be said that there is disobedience on the part of the Contemnor-Respondents, let alone wilful disobedience of the order, in the OA. Grievances regarding this order of Commissioner, if any, can be agitated as per law but not in a Contempt Petition.

4. In the circumstances, we find no reason to continue with the Contempt Petition. The notices issued are discharged, and the Contempt Petition is hereby dismissed.

*S.L.Jain*  
(S.L.Jain)  
Member (J)

*B.N.Bahadur*  
(B.N.Bahadur)  
Member (A)

mb