

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**BOMBAY BENCH**

CIP. 24/95

OPEN COURT / PRE DELIVERY JUDGMENT IN OA 232/94

Hon'ble Vice-Chairman / Member (J) / ~~Member (A)~~  
may kindly see the above Judgment for  
approval / signature.

*[Signature]*  
~~V.C. / Member (J) / Member (A) (K/S)~~  
14/1/95

Hon'ble Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Member (J)

I agree P.L. Dhanraj  
MCD

Hon'ble Member (A) (K/S)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

19

C.P.NO.24/95 in OA.NO. 252/94

Dated this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of <sup>October</sup> ~~Oct~~ 1999.

CORAM : Hon'ble Shri D.S.Baweja, Member (A)

Hon'ble Shri S.L.Jain, Member (J)

M.N.Nair,  
Foreman (Diesel),  
Under D.R.M.(Electrical),  
C.Rly., Bombay V.T.

...Applicant

By Advocate Shri K.B.Talreja

V/S.

Union of India through  
The General Manager, C.Rly.,  
Bombay V.T., Bombay (Shri A.K.Banerjee)

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Central Railway, Bombay V.T.  
Bombay (Shri Arun Dubey)

3. The Sr.Divisional Electrical  
Engineer (G), Central Railway,  
Bombay V.T., Bombay (Shri U.S.Acharya) Respondents

By Advocate Shri V.D.Vadhavkar

O R D E R

{Per : Shri D.S.Baweja, Member (A)}

This Contempt application has been filed on 6.1.1995  
alleging non compliance of the direction of the Tribunal in order  
dated 1.7.1994 in OA.NO. 252/94.

..2/-

20

2. The applicant had filed OA.NO. 252/94 challenging his suspension and non payment of subsistence allowance. The OA. was allowed on 1.7.1994 with the following direction :-

" We, therefore, direct that the suspension of the applicant shall be deemed to have been revoked from the date on which the penalty was imposed. The respondents shall work out the applicant's entitlement for pecuniary benefit which would flow from the above position within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and pay the amount, according to rules, within two months thereafter."

3. The applicant alleges that the above order of the Tribunal has not been implemented even after giving the copy of the order to the concerned authority on 20.10.1994 and making personal reminders thereafter. The applicant has therefore filed this contempt petition with a prayer to take suitable action against the respondents for non-implementation of the order dated 1.7.1994 and direct respondents to comply with this order.

4. The respondents have filed reply through Shri V.S.Acharya, Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer, C.Rly. Mumbai. The respondents have contended that <sup>the</sup> order dated 1.7.1994 was passed without the reply being filed by the respondents. The applicant had not disclosed the correct facts in the OA. as the

*[Handwritten mark]*

21

suspension of the applicant was not on account of disciplinary proceedings against which the penalty was imposed. The respondents therefore had filed a Review Application No.55/95.

5. The applicant has filed rejoinder reply wherein it is stated that revocation of the suspension has been done as per order dated 14.11.1994 with effect from 18.9.1987. The respondents have also issued posting orders as per order dated 16/17.11.1994. With this action, the only allegation of the applicant with regard to implementation of the order dated 1.7.1994 remains in respect of consequential benefits, i.e. fixing of correct basic pay after drawing yearly increments and arrears thereof etc.

6. The Review Application No.55/95 has been disposed of as per order dated 15.11.1996 with the following observations :-

"...As per the rules, the review petition has to be filed within three months from the date of receipt of the order. However, this is not the case here. Since the original respondents (Review Petitioners) have already implemented the order, the question of entertaining the Review Petition at this stage does not arise. Accordingly, Review Petition is disposed of."

7. From the material on <sup>the</sup> record, it is admitted fact that suspension of the applicant has been revoked from 18.9.1987 as per order dated 14.11.1994. Consequent upon revocation of the suspension, the applicant has been also posted as per order dated 16/17.11.1994. Thus the order dated 1.7.1994 to the extent of the revocation of the suspension has been complied with. The only issue that remains is with regard to entitlement of the

*[Handwritten signature]*

precuniary benefits which the applicant has brought out in the rejoinder reply. In the rejoinder reply, the applicant in reply to the written statement of the respondents has controverted the submissions about the payment for the suspension period. Respondents have brought out that the applicant has given false certificates about his unemployment during the suspension period as found after investigation <sup>and</sup> for the same applicant has been <sup>^</sup> already issued chargesheet. From the rival contentions, it is clear that the issue with regard to consequential benefits on revoking suspension is in dispute. Order dated 1.7.1994 provides that the consequential benefits will be allowed as per the rules. In view of this stipulation in the order, if the respondents do not pay the benefits as claimed by the applicant on the plea that the same are not admissible as per rules and the applicant seriously contests the same, then the issue cannot be resolved by going into the rival contentions and <sup>second</sup> ~~second~~ findings on the same in a contempt petition. In a contempt petition, it is to be seen whether there is substantial compliance of the order. The order issued in compliance of the Tribunal's order by the respondents may not be to the liking of the applicant and the applicant may feel aggrieved by the same. In such an event, it gives a fresh cause of action to agitate the matter for seeking legal remedy if so desired. In this connection, we refer to the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgements in the case of J.S.Parihar vs. Ganpat Duggar & Ors., 1996 SCC (L&S) 1422 and V.Kanakarajan vs. G.M.S.E.Rly., JT 1996 (7) SC 517.



8. In the present case, we find that <sup>the</sup> respondents have substantially complied with the order by revoking suspension and for the consequential benefits the applicant has been advised of the position as per the extant rules. Further, in the order dated 15.11.1996, in the Review Application, also the Bench has observed that respondents have already implemented the order. In this view of the matter, we do not find that there is any case of contempt of court made out by the applicant.

9. In the result of the above, the Contempt petition is without merits and the same is dismissed accordingly. The contempt of court notices issued to the respondents are discharged accordingly. No order as to costs.

*S.L. Jain*  
(S.L.JAIN)  
MEMBER (J)

*D.S. Baweja*  
(D.S. BAWEJA)  
MEMBER (A)

mrj.