

(95)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

CP.No.120/96.

Date of order: 22.11.96.

Between:-

Ch.Narayanacharyulu

...

Applicant.

And

Admiral V.S.Shekawath, I.N.
Chief of the Naval Staff, Naval
Headquarters, DHQ, P.O.
South Block, New Delhi-1100 11.

...

Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr.Ch.Narayana Charuulu

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr.N.R.Devaraj, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.G.CHOUDHARI, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI H.RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (A)

Hon'ble Tribunal made the following order:-

The applicant is absent. We have gone through the application as well as the order in the O.A. We have also gone through the order dated 23.11.95. The aforesaid order dated 23.11.95 passed by the Chief of Naval Staff shows that the points raised by the applicant in the appeal submitted during the personal hearing given to him on an earlier occasion have been examined by the respondents and the appeal has been rejected by giving a reasoned order. A grievance against that order cannot be made in the shape of Contempt Petition proceeds on the basis that the said order is bad in law on merits. Such cannot be a ground alleging contempt. It may be mentioned that in order dated 5.9.95 in O.A.No.277/95. The respondent No.2 was directed to dispose of the appeal of the applicant in accordance with the law keeping in view the observations in the order. The order of the Chief of Naval Staff is to this direction and proceeds to deal with the appeal.

-- 2 --

reference to the points raised by the applicant.
It cannot therefore be said that the original
order has not been complied with. Thus, the C.F.
is not maintainable and as it is not maintainable
it is rejected.

Amol
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (HBDL.)