

**22.CP 060/00156/2014 &**  
**MA 1106/2014 in**  
**O.A. NO. 060/00234/2014**

**Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain**

**20.08.2014**

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Kochhar, counsel for the petitioner

Since DB is not available today, adjourned to  
27.08.2014.

  
**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

'mw'

✓  
19.CP 060/00156/14 &  
MA 01106/14 in  
O.A. NO. 060/00234/14

**Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain**

**27.08.2014**

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Kochhar, counsel for the petitioner

Issue notice to respondents returnable on 10.10.2014.

K  
(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)  
MEMBER (A)

L  
(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)  
MEMBER (J)

mw'

Notice issued on  
02/09/14. Service is  
complete.

Reply Affidavit  
not filed.

✓ 2/10

DHIRENDRA SINGH

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH

3

34. CP 060/00156/2014 & MA 01106/2014 IN O.A. No.  
060/00234/2014

(Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain)

10.10.2014

Present: Sh. H.P.S. Kochhar, counsel for the applicant,  
Sh. K.K. Thakur, counsel for the respondents.

1. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks and is granted ten days time to file response to the C.P.
2. List on 17.11.2014.

Ke

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)  
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)  
MEMBER (J)

jk  
Reply Affidavit  
not filed

JK

REDDY SINGH

4  
11.CP 060/00156/14 & MA 01106/14 in  
O.A. NO. 060/00234/14

Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain

17.11.2014

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Kochhar, counsel for the petitioner  
Mr. K.K. Thakur, counsel for the respondents

1. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks and is granted a week's time for filing response to the CP.
2. List on 26.11.2014.

ke  
(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)  
MEMBER (A)

l  
(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)  
MEMBER (J)

'mw' Reply not  
filed.

24/11  
DHIRENDRA SINGH

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH

5

18. CP 060/00156/2014 & MA 01106/2014 IN OA No.  
060/00234/2014

(Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain)

**26.11.2014**

Present: Sh. H.P.S. Kochhar, counsel for the petitioner.  
Sh. K.K. Thakur, counsel for the respondents.

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that DCRG amount can not be released in favour of the petitioner for the simple reason that a criminal case has been registered against him.
3. Let documentation to this effect be placed on record by the next date of hearing.
4. List on 01.12.2014.

*vk*

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

*jk*

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

• 'jk'  
Reply Affidavit  
filed.

*28/11*

**DHIRENDRA SINGH**

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH

16. CP 060/00156/2014 & MA 01106/2014 IN O.A. No.  
060/00234/2014

**(Rampal Sharma Vs. S.K. Jain)**

**01.12.2014**

Present: Sh. H.P. S. Kochhar, counsel for the petitioner.  
Sh. K.K. Thakur, counsel for the respondents.

1. Heard.
2. The present C.P has been filed alleging non-compliance of the order dated 18.03.2014 wherein a direction was given to the respondents to decide the pending legal notice within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.
3. Pursuant to notice, the respondents filed an affidavit of Sh. S.K. Jain, HCS, Joint Registrar, Cooperative Societies Chandigarh and submitted on basis thereof that the gratuity and DCRG amount can not be released as an FIR has been registered against the petitioner, though all other due benefits have been released. This is strongly opposed by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that date indicated on these letters shows that the same have been issued after the issuance of notice in the present contempt petition. This has been done to deprive the applicant to release of his legal dues, by relying upon an FIR.
4. Be that as it may, direction was to decide the pending legal notice only. That has been decided and if the petitioner is still aggrieved, he can challenge the decision of the respondents on the original side being a fresh cause of action.

7

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH**

5. We may also record herein that direction was issued on 18.03.2014 to decide the pending legal notice within a period of two months, whereas, the respondents took almost 6 months to take a view in the matter. This attitude of the respondents compelled the petitioner to approach this Court again by filing the present C.P to get the order of this court complied with. However, a copy of this order be given to the authority higher to Joint Registrar, Cooperative Societies Chandigarh, to apprise him about the working in the respondent department, which appears to be far from satisfactory.
6. Considering the above, we are left with no other option but to dispose of the present C.P with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the orders passed on original side, if so advised.
7. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)  
MEMBER (A)**

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)  
MEMBER (J)**

'jk'