

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560 038.

Dated:- 28 MAR 1994

Contempt Petition (Civil) No.1 of 1994 in
APPLICATION NUMBER: 140 of 1993.

APPLICANTS:

Sri.K.Subrahmanyam

v/s.

RESPONDENTS:

Sh.S.Rajaram, Accountant General (A&E),
Karnataka and Other.

To.

1. Sri.K.Subrahmanyam,
S/o.Late B.V.Krishnamurthy,
No.158, Sixth Cross, 2nd Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore-11.
2. Sri.M.S.Padmarajaiah,
Sr.Central Govt.Stng.Counsel,
High Court Bldg, Bangalore-1.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the
Central administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/
STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/, passed by this Tribunal in the above
mentioned application(s) on 18th March, 1994.

Issued
28/3/94
R.

of c

for *Se Shanwar*
DEPUTY REGISTRAR 28/3
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE BENCH

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 1 OF 1994.

FRIDAY THIS THE 18TH DAY OF MARCH, 1994.

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, ... Vice-Chairman.
Mr. T.V. Ramanan, ... Member(A)

K. Subrahmanyam,
Major,
S/o late Shri B.V. Krishnamurthy,
working as Supervisor in the
office of the Accountant General (A & E),
Karnataka, Bangalore and residing at
No. 158, 6th Cross, Block-2, Jayanagar,
Bangalore-560 011..

.. Applicant.

(In person)

v.

1. Shri S. Rajaram,
Accountant General (A & E), Karnataka,
No. 1, Residency Park Road,
Bangalore -560 001.
2. Shri Montek Singh Ahluvalia,
Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Finance (DOE),
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

(By Standing Counsel Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah)

O R D E R

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:-

Having heard the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel we think no case is made out for hauling up the respondents for having not complied with the directions of the Tribunal. The compliance was regarding the computation or pay fixation of the petitioner to be done in accordance with Rule 7 of the CCS (Revised) Pay Rules, 1986. The order now made is in the purported obedience of the said Rule. But, it is however urged that in obeying the order of the Tribunal some mistake has been committed in the order now produced, as evidence of having been passed in supposed compliance of the directions of the Tribunal.