

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

Jaipur, the 08th November, 2005

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 50/2005

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 471/2001

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. A.K. AGARWAL, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. M.L. CHAUHAN, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

O.P. Sharma son of Shri Bajrang Lal Sharma by caste Sharma aged about 59 years resident of S-7, Kabir Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur presently working in the office of the Principal General Manager, Telecom District, Jaipur.

.....Applicant

By Advocate: Mr. P.N. Jatti.

versus

1. Dr. J.S. Sharma, Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Department of Telecom, Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Shri Mohan Lal Gumber, Chief General Manager, Telcom,
Rajasthan Circle, Jaipur.

3. Shri P.K. Saha, Principal General Manager, Telecom
District, Jaipur.

.....Respondent

By Advocate : Mr. B.K. Sharma.

ORDER (ORAL)

The Petitioner has filed this Contempt Petition for the alleged violation of the order dated 02.07.2002 passed in OA No. 471/2001.

2 Notices of this application was given to the respondents. The respondents have filed their reply. In the reply, they have given explanation as to why the order of this Tribunal could not be implemented within reasonable time. They have stated that a Writ Petition was filed before the Hon'ble High Court against the order of this Tribunal. It is further stated that after dismissal of the Writ Petition, the respondents have filed a Review Petition before the Hon'ble High Court, which is still pending. The respondents have further stated that despite pendency of the Review Petition, they have passed an order dated 26.09.2005 whereby the benefit arising out of the judgement of this Tribunal has been extended to the applicant subject to the final outcome of the decision of the Review Petition. The respondents have also annexed the copy of the order dated 26.09.2005 with the reply and marked as Annexure R/1.


3 Learned counsel for the applicant submits that respondents have not given consequential benefits arising out of the order dated 26.09.2005, thus direction given by

3


this Tribunal vide order dated 02.07.2002 has not been fully complied with.

4 Mr. M.P. Jain, Assistant General Manager, who ~~was~~ present in the court today submits that the consequential benefits arising out of the order dated 26.09.2005 shall be paid to the petitioner within a period of one month.

5 In view of the undertaking given by the Assistant General Manager, this Contempt Petition does not survive and the same shall stand disposed of accordingly. Notices issued to the respondents are hereby discharged.


(M.L. CHAUDHAN)

MEMBER (J)


(A.K. AGARWAL)

VICE CHAIRMAN

AHQ