

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex(BDA)
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 10-2-88

CONTEMPT OF COURT APPLICATION NO. 53 / 87
in Application No. 331/86(T)
W.P. NO. _____

Applicant

Shri D.D. Prasad
To

Respondent

V/s The AOC, HQ Trg Command, IAF & another

1. Shri D.D. Prasad
Senior Store Keeper
Elementary Flying School
Air Force Station
Bidar - 585 401
2. Shri G.N. Seshagiri Rao
Advocate
No. 18(Upstairs)
Opp : Nagappa Park
Srirampuram
Bangalore - 560 021
3. The Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief
HQ Training Command, IAF
Hebbal
Bangalore
4. The Commandant
Elementary Flying School
Air Force Station
Bidar - 585 401
5. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao
Central Govt. Stng Counsel
High Court Building
Bangalore - 560 001

Subject : SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER ~~STAY / INTERIM ORDER~~
passed by this Tribunal in the above said application on 8-2-88.

RECEIVED 4 Sep 10/2/88

Diary No. 1695/EN/88

Date: 11.2.88

Encl : As above

o/c for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE EIGHTH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1988

Present : Hon'ble Justice Shri K.S.Puttaswamy ... Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan ... Member (A)

CONTEMPT OF COURT A. NO.53/87(F)

D.D. Prasad,
Senior Store Keeper
PA No.24577,
Elementary Flying School,
Air Force Station, Bidar

... Petitioner

v.

Air Marshal, Air Officer,
Commanding-in-Chief,
HQ Training Command, IAF,
Hebbal, Bangalore.

Commandant,
Elementary Flying School,
Air Force Station,
Bidar-585 401

... Contemners

(Shri M.Vasudeva Rao. Advocate)

This application came up before this Tribunal for hearing today. Hon'ble Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

Case called. Petitioner and his learned counsel are absent. Wing Commander M.V. Patil, Administrative Officer of Air Force Station, Bidar, representing the contemners and their learned counsel Shri M.Vasudeva Rao are present.

2. Shri Vasudeva Rao files a Memo annexing a copy of the letter dated 3.2.1988 addressed to the Administrative Officer stating that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, had set aside the order made by us on 23.10.1986 in A No.331/86, the non-implementation of which is complained by the petitioner and had remitted the case for fresh disposal. We have no reason to disbelieve this assertion of the Contemners and accept the same as correct.



3. When once we accept the assertion of the Contemnners that the order itself made in favour of the petitioner had been set aside and is no longer in force, the question of this Tribunal proceeding against the contemnners for non-implementation of that order does not arise. In this view these contempt of court proceedings are liable to be dropped. We, therefore, drop the contempt of court proceedings against the contemnners. But, in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.

Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Sd/-

MEMBER(A)

bsv/np

TRUE COPY

AP 10/2/88

BANGALORE