

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

Contempt Petition No.9/99
In
Original Application No.1279/93

Dated this Monday the 17th Day of January, 2000

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

Shri M.I. Kulkarni

.. Applicant.

Vs.

1. Shri V.D. Gupta,
General Manager, Western Railway,
Churchgate, Mumbai.

2. Shri Bhatnagar,
Chief Electric Service Engineer,
Western Railway, Churchgate,
Mumbai.

.. Respondents/
Contemnors.

(By Advocate Shri V.S. Masurkar).

Tribunal's Order:

Learned Counsel for Respondents appears and places the facts before us. Written statement of the Respondents has already been seen. One point made before us is that orders have to be obtained in this case from the Railway Board, since the penalty proposed is one of reduction of pension. However, the fact is that the proposal was sent to the Railway Board in April, 1998 and no orders are yet available. This delay is serious.

2. Even considering that ^{above} consultations are necessary, it is difficult to imagine that no final decision can be reached in spite of a period of 1 year and 9 months having elapsed. This delay is not something that can be taken lightly. We are however inclined to wait and see what efforts can be made further.



...2..

3. We do hope that there will be no reason for the Railway Authorities to come and report that the orders of the Tribunal have not been complied with till next date.
Babu

4. We must also record here that it seems that no request for extension of time was made by the Railway Administration. It is does not show ~~that~~ a proper attitude.

5. Case posted to 15.3.2000, when the latest developments should be made known to us.

6. A copy of this order may be provided to the Counsel for Respondents.

S.L. Jain
(S.L. Jain)

Member (J)

B.N. Bahadur

(B.N. Bahadur)

Member (A).

H.