

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

* * *

Date of Order: 11.9.95.

CP No.51/95 (OA No.395/93)

Gordhan Singh, Jagdish, Babu Lal, Hari Singh, Shiv Charan, Mohan Pal, Nabi Chand, Bhagwan Singh, Suraj Singh, Mahendra Kumar, Om Prakash, Gorakh Singh, Gopal Singh, Fateh Singh and Nabant Singh

...PETITIONERS.

VERSUS

S/Shri Mohan Tiwari, H.L. Sahani and R.C. Arora

...RESPONDENTS.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. GOPAL KRISHNA, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. O.P. SHARMA, MEMBER (A)

For the Petitioners

... Mr. Shiv Kumar

For the Respondents

... Mr. Manish Bhandari

O R D E R

PER HON'BLE MR. GOPAL KRISHNA, VICE CHAIRMAN

Petitioners, named above, have filed this Contempt Petition u/s 17 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, stating therein that pursuant to the decision of the Tribunal in OA No.395/93 dated 7.4.94, these petitioners submitted their TA bills to the concerned authority but the respondents did not release the amount of TA bills even within a period of 10 months and as such they have intentionally dis-obeyed the directions of the Tribunal for extraneous reasons. It is also stated that the respondents are denying the claim of petitioners for one reason or the other.


2. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

3. The directions of the Tribunal was to the effect that; "the bills should be scrutinised immediately and necessary orders either for the payment of the bills or rejection thereof be passed within a period of three months from the receipt of a copy of this order". The respondents in their reply have alleged that the petitioners have already been paid the Travelling Allowance in accordance with rules under receipts. The details of payments made to the petitioners by the respondents have been produced by the learned counsel for the respondents today. The petitioners have received payments without any protest. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that after scrutinising the bills either full amount claimed therein should have been released in their favour or the claim for the entire amount should have been rejected, is not acceptable. If the petitioners have not received any amount

C.K. Mehta

due, as per rules, they are free to seek their redress according to law.

4. In the circumstances, no case of contempt is made out. The Contempt Petition is, therefore, dismissed. Notices issued are discharged.


(O.P. SHARMA)

MEMBER (A)


(GOPAL KRISHNA)

VICE CHAIRMAN

VK