

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

9

**Sr.No.33**

**C.P.NO.050/00073/2015 IN  
O.A.060/00586/2014**

**PARAMJIT KAUR VS. S.K. CHADHA ETC.**

**08.04.2015**

Present: Mr. Barjesh Mittal, counsel for the petitioner.

1. Heard.
2. Argues, inter-alia, that while allowing the Original Application along with a bunch of petitions on consensual basis, vide a common order dated 6.12.2014, the Bench had recorded a clear finding that the case of the applicants would be considered in view of law cited by learned counsel for the applicant i.e. Babli Devi & Another Vs. U.T. Chandigarh etc. as well as decision in the case of U.T. Chandigarh & Another Vs. Sampat & Others in C.A. No. 6779 of 2009 decided by Apex dispensation on 3.4.2014, but, while passing the order rejecting the claim of the applicants on the basis of decision in Bimla Devi Vs. UOI etc. is no consideration in the eyes of law and act, to say the least is contemptuous.
3. Issue notice to the respondents for 11.5.2015.

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

1  
**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

HC\*

1- hearing on 10/4/15  
A.D. Awarded please

WPS

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH CHANDIGARH

23. CP060/00073/2015 in O.A. No. 060/00586/2014

**Paramjit Kaur Vs. S.K. Chadha & Another**

**11.05.2015**

Present: Mr. Barejsh Mittal, proxy counsel for the petitioner

Mr. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents along with

Mr. Naval Kishore, EE PH Divn. No. 3

1. Mr. Naval Kishore, EE PH Divn. No. 3, who is present in Court, submits that the order dated 27.03.2015, rejecting the claim of the petitioner, has inadvertently been passed and, therefore, the same has been withdrawn vide order dated 08.05.2015, which is taken on record. He tenders his unconditional apology for the same, which is accepted.
2. He further submits that in pursuance of the orders of this Court, a fresh order dated 08.05.2015 has been passed granting the relevant benefits to the petitioner herein. The same is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents may be directed to release the actual benefits to the petitioner within a reasonable period. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the same will be disbursed to the petitioner within two months, to which the learned counsel for the petitioner agrees.
4. In view of the above, the CP has become infructuous and is dismissed as such. Notices stand discharged.

Uk

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)**

**MEMBER (A)**

'mw'

S  
**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**

**MEMBER (J)**

(3)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH

32. MA 060/01265/2015 IN CP 060/00073/2015 IN O.A. No.  
060/00586/2014

**(Paramjit Kaur Vs. S.K. Chadha & Anr.)**

**02.12.2015**

Present: Sh. Barjesh Mittal, proxy counsel for the applicant.  
Sh. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents.

1. The present MA has been filed by the applicant for revival of C.P.
2. Sh. Barjesh Mittal, proxy counsel for the applicant draws our attention to para 3 of the order dated 11.05.2015 wherein statement was made by the learned counsel for the respondents that actual benefits would be released to the petitioner within a period of two months and accordingly, C.P was disposed of. Despite lapse seven months, the respondents have failed to comply with relevant order.
3. Issue notice to the counsel opposite.
4. Sh. Arvind Moudgil, Nodal Officer appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. He seeks and is granted time to have instruction in the matter.
5. List on 14.12.2015.

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

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

'jk'

4

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH CHANDIGARH**

**15. MA 060/01265/2015 in**

**CP 060/00073/2015 in**

**O.A. No. 060/00586/2014**

**Paramjit Kaur Vs. Union of India & Others**

**14.12.2015**

Present: Mr. Barjesh Mittal, counsel for the applicant

Mr. Aseem Rai, counsel for Resp. No. 1

Mr. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for Resp. No. 2

1. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 seeks permission to file affidavit in the Court. Permitted. The same is taken on record. On the basis thereof, he submits that the amount of DCRG has already been paid to the petitioner and the case of family pension has been sent to Pay and Accounts Officer, New Delhi by the A.G. (UT) Chandigarh for disbursement. He seeks and is granted further one month time for filing compliance report.
2. List on 18.01.2016.

  
**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)**

**MEMBER (A)**

'mw'

  
**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)**

**MEMBER (J)**

*Amidn't filed  
by the R. No. 2*

*20/12/2015*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH

19. MA No.060/01265/2015 IN CP No.060/00073/2015 IN  
O.A. No. 060/00586/2014

**(PARAMJIT KAUR VS. S.K. CHADHA & ANR.)**

**18.01.2016**

Present: Sh. Barjesh Mittal, proxy for Sh. N.P. Mittal, counsel for the applicant in MA.  
Sh. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents.

1. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted further three weeks time, as a last opportunity, to fully comply with the order of the Tribunal. Compliance affidavit ~~may~~ be filed within one week *thereafter*.
2. List on 18.02.2016.

*Rs*  
**(RAJWANT SANDHU)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

*L.N.*  
**(JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

*rishi*

MA 1265/15 for order  
compliance affidavit  
not filed

*Yours/21*

(6)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

---

**17. MA No.060/01265/2015 IN CP No.060/00073/2015 IN  
O.A. No.060/00586/2014**

**(PARAMJIT KAUR VS. S.K. CHADHA & ANR.)**

**18.02.2016**

Present: Sh. Barjesh Mittal, proxy for Sh. N.P. Mittal, counsel for the applicant.  
Sh. Arvind Moudgil, counsel for the respondents.

1. Counsel for the respondents stated that requisite benefits have since been paid to the applicant.
2. Proxy counsel for the applicant stated that some benefits have been paid, but ex-gratia amount has not been paid, and daily wage service has not been counted.
3. Counsel for the respondents has stated that the applicant is not entitled to the same, and the respondents shall pass requisite speaking order in this regard within one month. It goes without saying that the applicant shall be at liberty to challenge any such order in appropriate proceedings as may be permissible under the law.
4. With the aforesaid observations, the instant MA for revival of the Contempt Petition is disposed of.

*h —*  
**(RAJWANT SANDHU)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

*l*  
**(JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

*rishi*