

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

C.P.57/2001 in
OA 749/1998

9/10/2001

Heard the applicant in person and Shri M.I.Sethna,
Counsel for Respondents.

Prima facie it appears to us that our order passed in OA No.749/98, R.V.Patel V/s. Union of India and Ors decided on 30/1/2001 was not complied within the stipulated period. We issued notice to Shri Hem Dulal Thakur, Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, Old CGO Building, 101, M.K.Road, Mumbai - 400 020.

In reply to the notice Shri Hem Dulal Thakur annexed a letter dated 27/6/2001 of Shri Jatinder Kumar, Deputy Secretary, Union Public Service Commission, Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi - 110 001 at Exhibit-6. On perusal of para-4 of said letter, we find that Jatinder Kumar, instead of complying ^{with} ~~the~~ the order mentioned above, has stated in his letter that "the recommendations of the DPC, which met on 19/7/97 in the said case, was in order and is not required to be reopened or reviewed as per the Government instructions." This, prima facie it appears to us to be wilful disobedience of the order of this Tribunal, ^{we} ~~we~~ issue suo moto notice to Jatinder Kumar as to why he should not be punished for wilful disobedience of above mentioned order under Section 11/12 of Contempt of Courts Act. He is directed to appear in person on 7/11/2001 and submit his reply.

In case he submits his reply and is represented by a lawyer on the date fixed, then he need not appear in person. The office is directed to send a copy of the application as well as

B. Singh

...2.

reply and rejoinder filed by the parties to Shri Jatinder Kumar. The applicant is directed to file a copy of application and rejoinder within three days while the respondents Shri Hem Dulal Thakur will file copy of the written statement/reply he has submitted together with annexures to the Registry within three days.

Shanta

(SMT. SHANTA SHASTRY)
MEMBER (A)

B. Dikshit
(B. DIKSHIT)
VICE CHAIRMAN

abp