

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**C.P. No. 281 of 2016 In
O.A.No.2106/2014**

New Delhi, this the 7th day of October 2016

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. P. K. Basu, Member (A)

Hakim Mahboob us Salam
Research Officer (Unani) (LRIUM)
Central Council for Research in Unani Medicine
Department of AYUSH
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
61-65 Institutional Area
Janakpuri, New Delhi-58

....Petitioner

(By Advocate: Mr. G. D. Chawla for Ms. Neha Garg)

Versus

1. Sh. Ajit M. Sharan
Secretary,
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare,
Department of AYUSH, Government of India,
Ayush Bhawan, B Block, G Complex
INA, New Delhi.

2. Dr. Raisurahman
The Central Council for Research in Unani Medicine
Through its Director General,
Jawaharlal Nehru AYUSH
Anushandhan Bhawan,
61-65, institutional Aream Opp. 'D' Block,
Janakpuri, New Delhi-110 058.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Dr. Ch. Shamshuddin Khan for R-1 and Mr. C. M. Jayakumar for R-2)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J) :

As is evident from the record that, while deciding Original Application (O.A) No.2106/2014, the respondents were directed to appoint the petitioner to the post of Research Officer (Unani) on regular basis, within a period of four weeks, by virtue of an order dated 20.11.2015 of this Tribunal.

2. According to the petitioner, the respondents have not complied with the directions of this Tribunal, which necessitated him to file the present Contempt Petition (C.P.).

3. In the wake of notice, learned counsel for the respondents appeared and placed on record the copy of an order dated 05.10.2016, whereby, they have offered the appointment to the post of Research Officer (Unani) on regular basis to the applicant.

4. Meaning thereby, the respondents have substantially complied with the directions contained in the indicated order of this Tribunal. Hence, no further action is required to be taken in the matter.

5. Therefore, the C.P. is hereby dismissed and rule of contempt is discharged.

Needless to mention that, in case the petitioner is still aggrieved by the order of appointment dated 05.10.2016 in any manner, he would be at liberty to file a fresh O.A. to challenge its validity, in accordance with law.

(P. K. Basu)
Member (A)

(Justice M. S. Sullar)
Member (J)
07.10.2016

/Jyoti/