

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**C.P. No. 277/2016
O.A. No. 2909/2013**

New Delhi, this the 2nd day of November, 2016.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. P.K. BASU, MEMBER (A)

Tika Ram Bhatt
S/o Late Shri Rattan Mani Bhatt
R/o Village San (Sakola)
PO Duniar, Distict Almora,
Uttaranchal-263623
Through His son Shankar Dutta Bhatt
C/o Flat No.641, Pocket-1,
Sector-22, Dwarka, Delhi.

.. Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mrs. Jasvinder Kaur)

Versus

Shri S.N. Singh,
SE-Director for E in C,
Director General (Pers),
MES, EIC Branch,
Army Head Quarters,
Kashmir House, Raja Ji Marg,
New Delhi.

.. Respondent

(By Advocate: Shri. J. S. Rana)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)

As is evident from the record that the Original Application (O.A) bearing No. 2909/2013, filed by the petitioner, Sh. Tika Ram Bhatt, was decided vide order dated 10.02.2015, by this Tribunal. The operative part of the order reads as under :-

“Therefore, it is their duty to grant the terminal benefits under the Rules. I, therefore, direct the Respondent No.1, namely, Directorate General

(Pers)/EIC in Engineer-in-Chiefs Branch, Army Headquarters, Kashmir House, DHG PO to ensure that the Applicants terminal benefits as admissible under the rules are determined and paid to him within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. He should also direct the concerned officer to ensure that the Applicant being a mentally incapacitated person should not be allowed to go from pillar to post for whatever terminal benefits he is entitled for.”

2. According to the petitioner, the respondent has not complied with the said order of this Tribunal, which necessitated him to file the instant Contempt Petition (C.P).

3. In the wake of notice, learned counsel for respondent appeared and placed on record copy of the order dated 31.10.2016, by virtue of which, the respondent has complied with the order of this Tribunal.

4. As, the respondent has already substantially, complied with the indicated directions contained in the order of this Tribunal, so no further action is required to be taken in the matter.

5. Therefore, the C.P is accordingly closed. The rule of Contempt is discharged. No costs.

6. Needless to mention, in case the petitioner still remains aggrieved with the impugned order dated 31.10.2016 of the respondent, then, he would be at liberty to file a fresh independent O.A to challenge its validity, in accordance with law.

(P.K. Basu)
Member (A)

(Justice M.S. Sullar)
Member (J)
02.11.2016

/Mbt/