

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GUWAHATI BENCH: GUWAHATI, 5. (FORM NO. 4)

ORDER SHEET.

(See Rule-42)

Contempt APPLICATION NO. 27/2000 (M. 15/95)

Applicant(s) Mr. Gobbi Singh.

Respondents(s) Sri Vidyamath Anandadas.

Advocate for Applicant(s) Mr. B.K. Sharma.

Mr. S. Sarma

Advocate for Respondent(s) Mr. U.K. Goswami.

Mr. A. Deb Roy, Esq.

Notes of the Registry

DATE

ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL

The learned
applicant Advocate
has filed this
contempt petition
for non-compliance
of order passed by
this Hon'ble Tribunal.

Laid before
Hon'ble court for
further orders.

trd

28/9/2000

Present : Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.N. Chowdhury,
Vice-Chairman.

Heard Mr. S. Sarma, learned counsel for
the contempt petitioner. Issue notice. Returnable
by 10.11.2000.

List on 10.11.2000 for orders.

Vice-Chairman

10.11.00

Mr. A. Deb Roy, learned counsel submitted
that he has been instructed by the respon-
dents to appear on behalf of contemner
No.1 and he is awaiting for receipt of the
formal power. Mr. Deb Roy on the basis of
the above submission sought for time to
file reply to the show cause. Prayer
allowed.

List on 8.12.2000 for further order.

Mr. P. Bora, learned counsel appearing on
behalf of alleged contemner No.2 has
stated that the aforementioned contemner
No.2 is not concerned with the matter.
The direction of this Tribunal was given
on the respondents to compute the cadre
strength of the promotion quota and that

Requisite filed.

Notice prepared and sent
to D/S for issuing the respondents
No. 1 & 2 vide D/S/No. 2249
2250 dtd 18/10/00

18/10/00

Order dtd 10/11/00 communicated
to both the parties Counsel. vide
D/No. dtd

contd..

Pl comply the
Order dated (0/11/2000)

✓
16/11/2000

10.11.00 exercise is to be made at the level of the Government of India, Ministry of Environment & Forest. The contemner No.2 is only serving as a Secretary to the Government of Manipur, Imphal. The submission of Mr Bora has some merit. The name of Shri P.Bhorot Singh, IAS, is therefore struck off from the petition as contemner No.2.

Office to act accordingly.

F. 12. a.

The name is in Capt.
Mr. 2 has been struck off
from the petition. vide pg
vide 10.11.00.

8.12.00 List this application alongwith
R.A.15/99 for orders on 22.1.2001.

Vice-Chairman

4-12-2000

Written statement
has been filed Contemner
No. 1.

mk

22.1.01

List on 19.2.01 for orders.

ICU Sharm
Member

Vice-Chairman

lm

19.2.01

List on 23.2.01 to enable the
applicant to take necessary steps.

ICU Sharm
Member

Vice-Chairman

lm

C.P.27/2000

(3)

Notes of the Registry

Date

Order of the Tribunal

16.7.2001

No representation stand out.
List on 17.7.2001 for order.

K C Shaha
Member

Vice-Chairman

bb

17.7.2001

On the prayer of Mr.A.Debb Roy,
learned Sr.C.G.S.G. for the respondents
the case is adjourned for three weeks to
enable him obtain necessary instructions.

List on 9-8-2001 for further order.

sr.

K C Shaha

Member

Vice-Chairman

bb

9.8.01

List on 31/8/01 as prayed for learned
counsel for the applicant.

K C Shaha

Member

Vice-Chairman

31.8.01

List on 18/9/01 for order.

Reply has been filed.

By order
5.10.01

mb

A. K. Jha

31/8

18.9.01

List on 8/10/01 to enable the
party to obtain necessary instructions.

K C Shaha
Member

Vice-Chairman

mb

8.10.01

report.

List on 16.11.2001 alongwith service

Reply has been filed.

By order
15.11.01

K C Shaha
Member

Vice-Chairman

Notes of the Registry	Date	Order of the Tribunal
	16.11.01	List on 24/12/01 for order. IC Usha Member
mb		Vice-Chairman
	24.12.01	List on 23.1.2002 to enable the parties to obtain necessary instructions IC Usha Member
mb		Vice-Chairman
	23.1.02	Heard Mr. S.Sarma, learned counsel for the applicant. It has been stated that against the judgment and order dated 28.12.1999 passed in O.A. No. 15/95, the respondents have moved the High Court and the matter is pending for consideration. In this circumstances, we refrain to exercise the jurisdiction over the <u>contempt</u> proceeding under section 17 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. Accordingly, the Contempt proceeding stands dismissed, at this stage. IC Usha
<u>31.1.2002</u> Copy of the order has been sent to the office for issuing the same to the L/Dmin for the public.		Member
HS		Vice-Chairman
27.1.2002	mb	

27 SEP 2000
Guwahati Bench

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GUWAHATI BENCH.

Contempt Petition No. 22/2000.

O.A. No. 15 of 1995.

Th. Ibobi Singh.

-vs-

Union of India & Ors.

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application under Section 17 of
the Administrative Tribunal Act
1985.

IN THE MATTER OF:

Judgment and order dated 20.1.99
passed in OA No. 15 of 1995 (Th.
Ibobi Singh -vs- UOI & Ors

- AND -

IN THE MATTER OF:

Willful and deliberate violation of
the order dated 20.1.99 passed in OA
No. 15/95.

- AND -

IN THE MATTER OF:

TH. Ibobi Singh, IFS, in the depart-
ment of Forest, Government of Manipur,
Imphal.

... petitioner

- vs -

1. Shri Viswanath Anand, IAS, Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Environment and Forest,
Pariyavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex,

Filed by:
The Applicant
through
Nijal Kr. Goswami
Advocate

Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

As per order dt. 10.11.98
the name of the Corp. no. 2
has been struck off from
the petition.

2. Shri P. Bhorot Singh, IAS, Secretary (DP), Government of Manipur, Imphal Secretariat, Imphal.

S. Repn No. 3. Respondents/Contemners.

*By
R. D. M.*

The humble application on behalf of the above named petitioners:

Respondent 3

Sri P. V.
Jay Krishnan,
Secy. to the Govt.
of India,
Ministry of
Environment
and Forests.
Addressed
order dt. 23.2.2001
Par. 14 H. P. B. M.
No. 64/2001.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. That the petitioner had filed this original application No. 15/95 making a grievance against his delayed promotion to IFS and consequential wrong fixation of year of allotment. The OA was disposed of by judgment and order dated 20.1.99 allowing the prayers made in the OA, with the direction that the year of allotment of the petitioner be calculated ante-dating the same from 1986.

A copy of the judgment of the judgment is annexed as

Annexure-1

2. That the respondent have receipt the copy of the said judgment through the registry of this Hon'ble Tribunal. The petitioner has also intimated the respondents regarding the aforesaid judgment urging upon them to implement the same. However, till this very date, the respondents have not done anything in the matter. The fact that the respondents are in receipt of the copy of the judgment is amply borne out from the fact that they have filed Review Application No. 282/99 and the same is still pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal. No stay order has been granted in the said Review Application and the judgment in question holds filed.

3. That by now almost one year has elapsed from the date of issuance of the judgment by the registry of this Hon'ble;

Tribunal but the respondents have not implemented the direction as contain in the judgment. In the process the petitioner has been made to suffer inasmuch as the delay in implementation of the judgment has adversely affected his promotional prospect, but for which he would have scored a march in his service career.

4. That the petitioner apart from submitting numerous representation also served a legal notice upon the respondents making a demand therein to comply with the aforesaid judgment and order, but the respondents have not done anything in the matter. Thus, they are guilty of willful and deliberate violation of the said judgment and order. The long silence on the part of the respondents by not paying any heed to the judgment of this Hon'ble Tribunal has made them liable for Contempt of Court Proceedings. The respondents cannot take this Hon'ble Tribunal for a ride. Merely because a Review Application has been filed, which is yet to be admitted, the respondents cannot go on flouting with the said judgment in perpetuity. All the endeavor made by the petitioner including service of legal notice has not yielded any result. Hence this application as a last resort.

The petitioner craves leave of this Hon'ble Tribunal to produce the copies of the representations and the legal notice as and when required.

5. That the petitioner submits that apart from invoking the Contempt Jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Tribunal, he has also invoked the inherent power of this Hon'ble Tribunal as envisaged under Rule 24 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules 1987.

6. That having regard to the facts and circumstances stated above it is a fit case to draw up Contempt of Court Proceedings against the respondents and also to invoke the power under Rule 24 of the aforesaid Rules, towards implementation of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

7. That the petitioners have filed this contempt petition bonafide and to secure the ends of justice.

In the premises aforesaid, it is most respectfully prayed that your Lordships would graciously be pleased to draw up contempt of Court's proceedings against the respondents for willful and deliberate violation of the judgment and order dated 20.1.99 passed in O.A.No. 15/95 and after hearing the parties and on perusal of the cause/causes that may be shown be pleased to punish them in accordance with law and further be pleased to pass appropriate orders invoking power under Rule 24 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules 1987 towards implementation of the said judgment and order and/or pass any such order/orders as may be deemed fit and proper considering the facts and circumstances of the case.

And for this, the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

DRAFT CHARGE

WHEREAS, the respondents are guilty of contempt of the Hon'ble Tribunal for willful and deliberate violation of the judgment and order dated 20.1.99 passed in O.A.No.15/95 by this Hon'ble Tribunal and accordingly Contempt of Court Proceeding is to be initiated against each of them.

-6-

AFFIDAVIT

I Th. Ibobi Singh, IFS, son of Th. Iboton Singh, aged about 45 years, working in the department of Forest, Government of Manipur, Imphal, do hereby solemnly affirm and state as follows :

1. That I am the Petitioner in the accompanying Contempt Petition and as such fully acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case.
2. That the statements made in this affidavit and in the accompanying petition in paragraphs 2 to 6 are true to my knowledge and those made in paragraphs 1 are as matters records which I believed to be true and the rests are my humble submission before the Hon'ble Tribunal and I have not suppressed any material facts of the case.

And I sign this affidavit on this the 27th day of September 2000.

Identified by:
U.K. Goswami
Advocate.

Sh. Ibobi Singh

Solemnly affirm and declared by the deponent, who is identified by Shri U.K. Goswami, Advocate on this the 27th day of September 2000.

True fine

-7-

Mr. J. B. Kauruk
-4-30140

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GUWAHATI BENCH

Original Application No. 15 of 1995.

Date of decision : This the 20th day of January 1999.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.N.Baruah, Vice-Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri G.L.Sanglyine, Administrative Member.

Th. Ibobi Singh,
Divisional Forest Officer,
Northern Forest Division,
Kangpokpi, Manipur

Applicant.

By Advocate Mr. B.K.Sharma.

-versus-

1. Union of India, represented by the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi.
2. Union Public Service Commission, represented by the Chairman, U.P.S.C. Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
3. The State of Manipur, represented by the Secretary, Department of Forests, Government of Manipur, Imphal, Manipur.
4. The State of Tripura, represented by the Secretary, Department of Forests, Government of Tripura, Agartala, Tripura.
5. V. Ramkanta, Dy. Conservator of Forests (Presently on Deputation to the State of Karnataka), C/o Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Karnataka, Bangalore.

A Kumar, Dy. Conservator of Forests, (Presently on deputation to the Govt. of India), C/o Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi.

7. G.Krishnan, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.

Contd....

.....

8. Balbir Singh, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.
9. G.S. Kadu, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.
10. Surender Kumar, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.
11. P.H. Prasad, Divisional Forest Officer, Chandel, Manipur.
12. R.K. Srivastava (Presently on deputation to the Govt. of India), Asstt. Inspector General of Forests, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi.
13. Jagabandhu Mishra, Divisional Forest Officer, Tamanglong, Manipur.
14. Korothouvi, Divisional Forest Officer, Social Forestry Division 1, Manipur, Imphal.
15. A.K. Roy, Divisional Forest Officer, on deputation to the TFDPC Ltd., Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.
16. A. Rastogi, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, on deputation to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Paryavaran Bhavan, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi.
17. P.K. Pant, Divisional Forest Officer, Tripura, C/o PCCF, Tripura, Agartala.
18. B.H. Mohanty, Divisional Forest Officer, Manipur, presently on deputation to Odisha as DCG, Office of the Regional CCF, Bhubaneswar.
19. D.J.N. Anand, Divisional Forest Officer, Jaribam, Manipur.

Respondents.

By Advocate Mr. A. Deb Roy, Sr. C.G.S.C.

Contd...

BARTUAN J. (V.C.)

The applicant at the material time was a member of Manipur Forest Service and was holding the post of Assistant Conservator of Forests. In the year 1985 he became eligible for consideration for promotion to Indian Forest Service (for short the IFS). However he was not considered for promotion due to the non-availability of post in that year. For the subsequent years namely for the years 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989 he was not recruited. In the year 1989 the applicant was a lone member selected for appointment to the IFS by way of promotion. This year also he could not be appointed due to non-availability of post. In the next year he was selected and promoted to IFS by Annexure-IV Notification dated 30.8.1990. By Annexure VI Order dated 6.9.1992 his year of allotment was given as 1986 and the same was communicated to the applicant on 29.8.1993. Prior to that the applicant submitted a representation in the year 1991 apprehending that the authority might give incorrect year of allotment. He claimed that his year of allotment ought to be 1984. After the Annexure-VI order the applicant submitted yet another representation (Annexure-VII A) dated 16.3.1993. This representation was not disposed of. Thereafter in the month of

10/

Contd...
concluded

November/December 1993 he visited Delhi Office and he came to know that his said representations had not yet been forwarded to the Head Office for taking step in the matter. Accordingly Delhi Office advised the applicant to file a fresh representation.

On being so advised he submitted a fresh Annexure-VIII representation dated 17.1.1994. Even after submission of Annexure-VIII representation nothing had been done. Hence the present application.

2. In due course respondens have entered appearance. Union of India, respondent No.1 has filed written statement. In the written statement respondent No.1 has refuted the claim of the applicant. According to the respondent No. 1 the year of allotment was rightly assigned in strict compliance with the provision of Rule 3(2) (6) of IFS Regulation of Seniority Rules 1968. In paragraph 10 of the written statement respondent No.1 has stated regarding the Triennial Cadre Review. We quote the relevant portion of the paragraph 10 :

"10. After the proposals have been received, these are examined by the Cadre Review Committee which, among others, is represented by State officials also. Based on the recommendations of the Cadre Review Committee, necessary changes are made in the strength and composition of a particular cadre. It is admitted that the last Review of the strength and composition of the Manipur-Tripura cadre of the IFS was notified on 22.11.90. It is submitted that the issue of Triennial Cadre Review having not been held during 1985-1990, cannot be agitated by the applicant at this belated stage."

In paragraph 14 of the said written statement it is stated that there could be some reasons beyond the control of the State Government for not holding meetings in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission on regular yearly basis. In any case, this matter could not be agitated at this belated stage.

The other respondents including the state of Manipur have not filed any written statement. Besides these, the applicant also claimed about the 33.33% deputation reserve quota. This was however not done in spite of the claim of the applicant. A specific averment has been made in the original application but there has been no reply to the same. The respondent No.1 in its written statement remained silent in the matter. The other respondents as stated hereinbefore have not filed any written statement.

3. We have heard Mr. B.K. Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant and Mr. A. Deb Roy, learned Sr. C.G.S.C.

4. Mr. Sharma submits that it has not been explained as to why after 1985 when the applicant became eligible for promotion he had not been considered for promotion to IFS for the subsequent years viz. 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989. The written statement filed by the respondent No.1 has not dealt with

Contd...

Concl...

(b) this matter. Only in paragraph 14 of the written statement the respondent No.1 has stated that there could be some reasons beyond control of the State Government for not holding meetings for selection during those years as quoted above. The respondent No.1 may not have proper knowledge in the matter. It is the State Government who have such knowledge. Unfortunately the State Government has not taken steps for filing any written statement. Except that nothing has been mentioned. Mr. Sharma on this point submits that because of non-selection in those years the applicant was deprived of his promotion. The second submission of Mr. Sharma that last Triennial Cadre Review was held on 29.3.85 and the next Cadre Review ought to have been on 29.3.88 i.e. after 3 years as contemplated in Rule 4(2) of IFS Cadre Rules but no proper reason has been assigned for not doing so thereby the applicant was deprived of his legitimate due. On this ground Mr. Sharma submits that at least as per the above Rule 4(2) of the IFS Cadre Rule, Cadre Review ought to have been in March, 1988. The State Government had in fact sent proposals on 7.4.1987. The third submission of Mr. Sharma is that the promotion quota was not fixed as required against the 33.33% on deputation reserve against item 5 of IFS (Fixation of Cadre Strength) Regulations, 1966. In this connection Mr. Sharma has drawn our attention to a decision

reported in 1987 (4) SLJ (CAT) (K.K.Goswami vs. Union of India & Ors.). and another decision of Calcutta Bench of the Tribunal (Dhuti Kr. Basu & Anr. vs. Union of India & Ors.). Mr. Sharma submits that against both the judgements SLPs had been filed before the Apex Court and both the SLPs were dismissed by the Apex Court by Annexure-XI and XII orders dated 24.8.95 and 18.4.88. Mr. Sharma therefore submits that the decision of those Benches of the Tribunal have become final. As per the decisions of the Calcutta and Jabalpur Bench of the Tribunal, 33.33% promotion quota against deputation was required to be fixed. By the aforesaid two decisions the Tribunal gave direction to the respondents to compute the promotion quota in the State Forest Service. As this was not done according to Mr. Sharma the applicant was made to suffer. Had this been done the applicant would have been promoted much earlier.

5. Mr. Deb Roy on the other hand tries to support the action of the respondents. According to him the year of allotment has been rightly fixed. Regarding Cadre Review, Mr. Deb Roy submits that this could not be done by the State Government because the reasons beyond control of the State Government.

On the rival contention of the parties now it is to be seen whether the applicant is entitled to relief as claimed for as per the provision of

57

Contd....

14
Rule 4(2) of Indian Forest Service (Cadre) Rules 1966. Under the said Rules, the Central Government is required to re-examine the strength and composition of each such cadre in consultation with the State Government concerned and may make such alterations therein as it deems fit. This must be done at the interval of 3 years. The sub-Rule (2) of Rule 4 of IFS (Cadre) Rules, 1966 is quoted below :

" (2) The Central Government shall at the interval of every three years, re-examine the strength and composition of each such cadre in consultation with the State Government concerned and may make such alterations therein as it deems fit :

Provided that nothing in this sub-rule shall be deemed to effect the power of the Central Government to alter the strength and composition of any cadre at any other time :

Provided further that the State Government concerned may add for a period not exceeding one year, and with the approval of the Central Government for a further period not exceeding two years, to a State or Joint Cadre one or more posts carrying duties of responsibilities of a like nature to a cadre posts."

A mere reading of sub-Rule (2) of Rule 4 of IFS (Cadre) Rules, 1966 it appears that Central Government is required to re-examine the strength and composition of each such cadre in consultation with the State Government at an interval of 3 years and may make alteration therein. The word 'shall' has been used in the said sub-Rule. This suggests that the provision is mandatory in nature. In this connection, Mr.

23

15

Sharma has drawn our attention to a decision of Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal in the case of Jacob P. Thomas Vs. Union of India & Ors. reported in SLJ (CAT) 1992 (3) 85. In the said judgement in para 14 the Tribunal observed as follows :

"14. Having considered the instructions of Government of India, one has now to consider whether the language used in Rule 4(2) compels one to reach a conclusion that the notification as a result of the triennial review should be effective from the third anniversary of the earlier notification. The expression used in Rule 4(2) is "at intervals of every three years" which mean that the interval between one fixation of cadre strength and another shall be three years, no more or no less. This is due to the fact that the expression "interval" is defined to mean intervening time or space in Concise Oxford Dictionary."

From the reading of this sub-rule 2 of Rule 4 of the Cadre Rules we also feel that the Rule suggests that it should be done immediately at the interval of 3 years and it is of mandatory nature. In that matter we are in respectful agreement with the decision of the Ernakulam Bench in this regard.

Regarding the computation of the deputation reserve quota as has been held by the Jabalpur and Calacutta Bench the deputation reserve quota are to be computed for the purpose of determining the strength of the promotion quota. Unfortunately this has not been done. We are also of the same view.

Therefore in view of the above, we find sufficient force on the contention of Mr. Sharma

B

Contd....

-10-

and we are of the opinion that the Triennial Cadre Review ought to have been held at the interval of 3 years as this was not done as held by the Ernakulam Bench the year of allotment should be computed relating to the year of allotment earlier than 1986. Regarding deputation reserve quota as this was not done we give direction to the respondents to compute the cadre strength promotional quota after giving deputation reserve quota and give the benefit of promotion quota to the applicant in the manner he is entitled to.

With the above direction the Original Application is allowed. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case we, however make no order as to costs.

Sd/- VICE CHAIRMAN
Sd/- MEMBER (ALMN)

TRUE COPY

நிலை

trd

Myre Sagar
Deputy Registrar (A)
Central Administrative Tribunal
Gurugram Bench

AC 98

of the case that there had been any lapse on my part then I hereby tender unqualified apology and sincere regret for the same. I cannot even think of doing any act or ommitt to do any act which may be construed or treated as an act or omission amounting to contempt of court or disobedience or violation of any order of the Hon'ble Tribunal. I hold Hon'ble Tribunal in highest and utmost respect and regard.

3. That I say and submit that the Contempt Petition of the petitioner is misconceived, untenable and hence the notice issued to the present respondent is required to be discharged.

4. That I submit that this Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 20.1.99 had directed the respondents to compute the promotion posts in the Manipur Tripura Joint Cadre of the Indian Forest Service after taking into account the State Deputation Reserve also. It was also held by the Hon'ble Tribunal that the Triennial Cadre Review ought to have been held at the interval of three years. The implementation of the Hon'ble Tribunal's order was that the seniority of the petitioner in the IFS be re-fixed. Aggrieved by the impugned order the Union of India filed Review Application before this Hon'ble Tribunal which has been admitted as R.A. No. 15/1999. Since the Review Application is still pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal the petitioner cannot press for the implementation of the impugned order dated 20.1.99 at this stage.

V. Anand
V. ANAND
SECRETARY
Ministry of Small Scale Industries
& Agro and Rural Industries
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi

Contd.....

P R A Y E R

In view of the submissions made herein above I respectfully pray that the present contempt proceeding is liable to be dismissed by discharging the notice issued to the respondent.

V E R I F I C A T I O N

Verified on the 28th day of November 2000 that the contents of this affidavit are true and correct to my knowledge based on the official records and belief legal submissions made herein are true upon legal advice received and believed to be correct. Nothing is false therein.

V. Anand
V. ANAND
DEPONENT SECRETARY
Ministry of Small Scale Industries
& Agro and Rural Industries
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi

859 6/ DEC 2000

गुवाहाटी न्यायालय
Guwahati Bench

Filed by
J. DEBROY

St. C. A. 12/2000
A. DEBROY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GUWAHATI BENCH :::: GUWAHATI.

C.P. NO. 27 OF 2000
IN O.A. No. 15 of 1995.

Shri Ibobi Singh

..... Petitioner.
- Vs -

Shri Vishwanath Anand.

..... Contemner No. 1
Respondent

I Shri Vishwanath Anand now & holding the office
of Secretary Small Scale and I am not now Secre
tary, Ministry of Environment and Forests to the Govt. of
India, do hereby solemnly affirm and say as follows :-
V. ANAND
SECRETARY
Ministry of Small Scale Industries
& Agro and Rural Industries
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi

1. That I am acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case on the basis of the records maintained in the Ministry of Environment and Forests. I have gone through the petition and understood the contents thereof. Save and except whatever is specifically admitted in this reply, rest of the averments will be deemed to have been denied.

2. That I have the highest reverence and regard for the Hon'ble Tribunal and its orders. If it, however, be held on consideration of the facts and circumstances

Contd.....

V. ANAND
SECRETARY
Ministry of Small Scale Industries
& Agro and Rural Industries
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi