IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

C.P. 27/94 in D.A. 62/94.

Dt. of Decision : 15.12.1994.

1. G. Appala Raju 2. R. Narasinga Rao

3. R.Ramana

4. R.Siinivasa Rao

5. S.Balakrishna

7. K.Nooka Raju

8. G.Dasu

9. P.Nagaraju

10. Prvenu

11. D.Rama Rao

12. 5.Ramu

Petitioners.

٧s

Vizay Tivar, Commander, C.O.Circar, Visbakapatnam.

.. Respondent.

Counsel for the Metitioners : Mr. M. Kasava Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V.Raghava Reddy, Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.V. HARIDASAN : MEMBER (JUDL.)

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI : MEMBER (ADMN.)



CP. 27/94 in DA. 62/94.

Ot. of Decision: 15.12.1994.

ORDER

As per Hon'ble Shri A.V. Haridasan, Member (Judl.)

This contempt petition arises out of an interim order passed in DA.62/94 on 28.1.1994. While the DA was admitted the following interim order was passed:— "Reply to be filed within 30 days. In the meantime it is closed that in case retrenchment of the applicants becomes inescapable for want of work, the principles of 'last come first go' shall be observed by the respondents".

- The grievance of the petitioner is that while persons junior to him are retained, he has been denied work and that this action of the respondents amount, the flouting of the interim order and calling for action against them under the contempt of courts act.
- Counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondents in which it has been clarified that the dis-engagement of the applicant was not retrenchment, but owing to want of work and for his misbehaviour towards the senior officer.
- In view of the clarification given in the reply statement that the applicant was not retranched, we do not find any disobedience of the interim order warranting action under the contempt of courts act. If the petitioner is aggrieved by his disengagement he is free to initiate appropriate proceedings for the appropriate relief. The CP is therefore dismissed and the notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

