

**In The Central Administrative Tribunal
Jaipur Bench, Jaipur**

OA/TA/MP. No. /199

Shanker Lal

Versus

Shri R. D. Singh

Date of Order	Orders
<u>13.3.95</u>	<p><u>CP/95/94 (OA/212/88)</u></p> <p>Shri R.M. Sharma, counsel for the petitioner. Shri M. Rafiq, brief holder for Shri Praveen Balwada, counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This is a Contempt Petition stating therein that the respondents is not paying the salary to the applicant/petitioner for the period from 3.2.93 to 29.9.93 and has committed dis-obedience of the directions of a Division Bench of this Tribunal, issued in OA 212/88 by an order dated 29.8.93, which reads as follows :-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"In the result, the OA is allowed and the verbal termination order dated 27.2.88 is set aside and the applicant shall be treated as Casual Labour of the respondents. As far as the question of back wages are concerned, we are not inclined to pass an order and the petitioner is directed to move an application under Sec.33(c)(2) of the I.D. Act before the Labour Court for computation of the wages according to law and he will be entitled for future wages without computation."</p> <p>2. In the reply filed on behalf of the respondents, they have stated that the applicant has been taken back on duty on 29.9.93 and since the applicant had not worked from 3.2.93 to 29.9.93 with the respondents, he is not entitled to claim wages for this period. As the applicant has been taken back on duty in compliance of the directions of this Tribunal, we find that there was no dis-obedience of the order in question. So far as his claim for wages for the period from 3.2.93 to 29.9.93 is concerned, the applicant may seek appropriate remedy before a competent legal forum.</p> <p>3. We do not find any substance in this Contempt Petition now and the same is therefore dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(O.P. SHARMA) MEMBER (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(COPAL KRISHNA) MEMBER (J)</p>