

(OPEN COURT)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD
BENCH, ALLAHABAD

(This the 12th Day of July 2018)

Hon'ble Mr. Gokul Chandra Pati-AM
Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Sagar Jain- JM

CCP No. 139 of 2017
(Arising out of Original Application No.648 of 2017)

1. Gulab Mishra son of Late Rajdeo Mishra, resident of Village Deoghat, Post Office and Police Station Bhatni, District Deoria.

..... **Applicant**

By advocate: Shri K K Mani

Versus

1. Mr. S.K. Jain, Director General (Establishment) Department of Telecommunication 10th Floor Doorsanchar Bhawan, 20 Ashok Road, New Delhi.
2. Anil Kumar, Director (Staff) Department of Telecommunications 5th Floor 20, Ashok Road Door Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi (Respondent no. 3/Competent Authority).
3. T.N. Shukla, Chief General Manager (Telecom U.P. East, Telecom Circle Lucknow.
4. Gaya Pratap, General manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited District Gorakhpur.
5. G.P. Tiwari, Telecom District Manager Deoria, District Deoria (Respondent no. 6/Competent Authority).

..... **Respondents**

By advocate: Shri D. S. Shukla

ORDER

Delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Gokul Chandra Pati –A.M.

This contempt petition has been filed for non compliance of the order dated 26.05.2017 passed by this Tribunal in OA No. 648 of 2017, wherein a direction was given to the respondent no. 3/competent authority to decide the representation dated 31.03.2017 by passing a reasoned and speaking order within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

2. In the compliance affidavit filed on 01.12.2017, the respondents have enclosed the order dated 04.10.2017 by which the representation of the applicant has been disposed of and he has been given appropriate

posting as stated by the learned counsel for the respondents and the salary has also been released. Now, the present claim of the applicant as per the supplementary affidavit filed on 06.07.2018 is that he is entitled to salary of Rs. 57,441/- per month, however, he is being given Rs. 32,434/- per month. He also submitted there is some dispute with regard to payment of arrears that has been released. These are separate cause of actions, for which the applicant can pursue proper remedy under law.

3. In view of the above we are of the view that the order dated 26.05.2017 of this Tribunal has substantially been complied with.

4. Accordingly, the contempt petition is dismissed and the notices issued stands discharged. However, the applicant is at liberty to pursue his grievance, if any, as per provisions of law.

(Rakesh Sagar Jain)

Member (J)

(Gokul Chandra Pati)

Member (A)

Arun.