

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORDERS OF THE BENCH

Date of Order: 09.07.2014

CP No. 291/00003/2014 (OA No. 366/2013)

Mr. S.K. Bhargava, proxy counsel for
Mr. Nand Kishore, counsel for petitioner.
Mr. M.S. Raghav, counsel for respondent Nos. 1 & 2.
Mr. Amit Mathur, proxy counsel for
Mr. R.B. Mathur, counsel for respondent No. 3.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This Contempt Petition was filed by the petitioner for the non-compliance of the order dated 20.09.2013 passed by this Bench of the Tribunal in OA No. 366/2013 with MA No. 313/2013. Vide para 16 of the order dated 20.09.2013, the respondents were directed to treat the applicant on duty w.e.f. 06.04.2011 and grant him all the consequential benefits thereof. However, the respondents were at liberty for passing a fresh order of suspension or any other appropriate order, if they so chooses and the circumstances so warranted in accordance with the law.

In reply to the notices, the respondents have filed their reply. In para 8 of the reply of the C.P., it has been stated that the applicant has been treated on duty w.e.f. 06.04.2011 to 19.12.2013 in compliance of the Tribunal's order dated 20.09.2013. An amount of Rs. 3,48,457/- after deducting income tax of Rs. 70,830/- has also been paid vide cheque No. 449111 dated 24.02.2014. Further, order of pay re-fixation was also issued on 13.02.2014.

Learned counsel for the respondent no. 3 submits that the applicant has again been put under suspension w.e.f. 20th December, 2013 in public interest as a criminal case is pending against him.

Learned counsel for the applicant vehemently contested the compliance report submitted by the respondents.

However, we are satisfied with the compliance report available on record. Thus, no contempt is made out. The Contempt Petition does not survive. Accordingly, the Contempt Petition is dismissed. Notices issued earlier to the respondents are discharged.


(RAJ VIR SHARMA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER


(ANIL KUMAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER