

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:

HYDERABAD

M.A.No.653/2001 in O.A.No.1176/1999.

DATE OF ORDER: 7-9-2001.

Between:

1. Union of India, rep., by Secretary, Govt. of India, Dept. of Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan, 20-Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110 001.
2. The Sr. Deputy Director General (BW), Department of Telecom, 10th Floor, Chandralok Building, Janpath, New Delhi.
3. The Deputy Secretary (CW), Department of Telecom, 10th Floor, Chandralok Building, Janpath, New Delhi.

Applicants
... Respondents/

and

1. Smt. S.Q. Nasreen Quadri, w/o Shri Khaliqu Shareef, working as Surveyor of Works (Civil), O/o Chief Engineer (C), Abids, Hyderabad, Deptt. of Telecom, (On deemed deputation to BSNL). ... Respondent/Applicant
2. Shri S.K. Babbar, Superintending Engineer (C), Telecom Civil Circle-I, Calcutta.
3. Shri P.K. Jain, Superintending Engineer (C), Telecom Civil Circle, Ambala.
4. Shri Niraj Goel, Superintending Engineer (C), Telecom Civil Circle, Coimbatore.
5. Shri B. Venugopal, Superintending Engineer (C), Telecom Civil Circle, BSNL, Visakhapatnam.

... Respondents/
Respondents

✓

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS :: Mr.V.Rajeshwar Rao

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT(S) : Mr.V.Venkateswara Rao

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN
THE HON'BLE SRI M.V.NATARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

: O R D E R :

(PER HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN)

This is an application for extension of time by three months from 18-8-2001 to 17-11-2001 to implement the directions of this Tribunal in our Order in the above OA dated 8-3-2001. It is stated by the learned Counsel for the Applicants that in view of the ^{fact that the} applicant being a party respondent in O.A.No.513 of 1998 filed before the Mumbai Bench of this Tribunal and the Judgement of the Hon'ble Mumbai Bench being contrary to the Judgement of this Tribunal out of which this contempt arises, the respondents have referred the matter to the DOP&T, Delhi and they have not received any intimation in this regard.

2. This application is resisted by the respondent. It is stated that the applicants herein have/already taken time by two months from 18-6-2001 and even after the expiry of the extended period, the Order was not complied with. It

is now stated by the learned Counsel for the Respondent that the Writ Petition filed by the applicants herein against the Judgement of this Tribunal before the Hon'ble High Court has been dismissed affirming the Judgement of this Tribunal.

3. Now the Judgement of this Tribunal has become final, the applicants cannot but comply with the Order as directed.

^{in the OA}
The only direction given was to consider the case of the respondent for promotion and the OA was disposed of as early as March, 2001 giving three months time. The conflict of the ^{judgment of} Mumbai Bench of this Tribunal cannot be a valid ground at all for non-compliance of the Order. Time has already been extended no further time is given.

4. The MA is dismissed.

M. V. Natarajan
(M. V. NATARAJAN)
MEMBER (A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY)
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: this the 7th day of September, 2001

Dictated in the Open Court

DSN

1292001