

(8)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

* * *

Date of Decision: 18.12.96

CP 24/95 (OA 699/93)

Mahipal Jain, Banwari Lal Bairwa, Ram Babu Sharma, Kishan Lal Jat, Ram Prasad Raigar, Hans Raj Meena, Ram Dayal Bairwa and Ram Pratap Singh (All are working as Postal Assistants, Tonk Division, Tonk)

... Petitioners

Versus

1. Shri Gauttam Gupta, Chief Post Master General, Rajasthan Circle, Jaipur.
2. Shri Bashir Ahmed, Supdt. of Post Offices, Tonk Division, Tonk.

... Respondents

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.GOPAL KRISHNA, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR.S.C.VAISH, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

For the Petitioners

... Mr.F.P.Fareek, brief holder for
Mr.S.K.Jain

For the Respondents

... Mr.U.D. Sharma

O R D E R

PER HON'BLE MR.S.C.VAISH,ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Petitioners, named above, had come in this Contempt petition No.24/95, stating that the directions dated 17.5.94, issued by this Tribunal in OA 699/93, had not been complied with. A notice was issued to the respondents, who have filed reply, to which the petitioners have filed objections.

2. We have heard Shri F.P.Fareek, brief holder for Shri S.K. Jain, counsel for the petitioners, and Shri U.D.Sharma, counsel for the answering respondents. The reply in the record show that this Tribunal had directed;

"We direct the respondents to examine the matter of the applicants in the light of the said judgements and if the applicants are similarly situated persons, then the benefit of the judgements of the Chandigarh Bench and Ernakulam Bench should be given to the applicants also. The process of Examination should be completed within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. OA is disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs."

Now the respondents aver that they have paid to the petitioners what was due to them under the judgements. The counsel for the petitioners has objected that the amount paid does not ^{show} clearly for the period that it

mmL

was paid and also that bonus, HFA, CCA etc. have not been included. He has also urged that in the Ernakulam Bench judgement consequential benefits legally due to them according to law have not been extended to the applicants.

3. The respondents have substantially complied with the judgement and no contempt is made out. However, if the petitioners are of the view that their full claim has not been settled, they may prefer a representation to the respondents itemising their claims under the judgement and if the respondents receive such a representation, they may consider it.

4. The Contempt Petition is dismissed with the above observations. Notices issued are discharged.

m m L
(S.C.VAISH)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

G. Krishna
(GOPAL KRISHNA)
VICE CHAIRMAN

VK