

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 10 OF 1997.

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 861/1995.

FRIDAY, THIS THE 22ND DAY OF AUGUST, 1997.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri B.S.Hegde, Member(J),
Hon'ble Shri P.P.Srivastava, Member(A).

K.V.Prasad Rao.

... Applicant.

V/s.

Union of India & Anr.

... Respondents.

(By Advocate Shri V.S.Masurkar)

O R D E R

Per Shri B.S.Hegde, Member(J)

Heard the applicant who is present in person
and Shri V.S.Masurkar, counsel for the Respondents.

2. The applicant has filed a Contempt Petition
against the order passed by the Tribunal on 8.3.1996,
wherein, the Tribunal had directed the applicant to
submit a detailed representation to the concerned
authority along with necessary evidence such as a
statement from some of the employees of his unit who in
the normal course would have been aware as to whether he
had worked or not on those days. On receipt of the
representation the respondent No.2 will dispose of the
same within a period of four weeks from the date of
receipt of such representation by passing a speaking
order. The applicant made a representation 13.3.1996
pursuant to the direction of the Tribunal, but no
documentary evidence was adduced by the applicant in

Ka

in support of his contention. The respondents vide their order dt. 20.4.1996 passed an order stating that the applicant has submitted the application without necessary evidence such as statement from some of the employees of his unit who in normal course would have been aware as to whether he had worked or not on those days. Accordingly, they have stated that the representation made by the applicant is not in accordance with the directives of the Tribunal, the same was disposed of.

3. In the circumstances, we do not find any contempt on the part of the respondents. The C.P. is discharged. ^{455/97} M.P. 1 is dismissed.


(P.P. SRIVASTAVA)
MEMBER (J)


(B.S. HEGDE)
MEMBER (A)

B.