

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi

**CP No. 283/2017  
OA No. 2520/2014  
MA No. 1627/2017**

New Delhi this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Srivastava, Member (A)**

Parveen Sharma,  
W/o Sh. Vir Vijay Kumar,  
Aged about 60 years,  
R/o C-114, Vivek Vihar,  
Delhi-110095

- Petitioner

(By Advocate: Mr. Yogesh Mahur)

Versus

Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors. through

1. Smt. Punya Salila Srivastava,  
The Secretary,  
Department of Training & Technical Institute,  
Muni Maya Ram Marg, Pitampura,  
Delhi-110088
2. Sh. Manoj Kumar,  
The Director,  
Department of Training & Technical Institute,  
Muni Maya Ram Marg, Pitampura,  
Delhi-110088
3. Ms. Jyotsna Sitling, The Director  
National Institute of Entrepreneurship &  
Small Business Development,  
Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises,  
Government of India, A-23, Institutional Area,  
Sector-62, NOIDA

- Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. NK Singh for Ms. Avnish Ahlawat)

**O R D E R (Oral)**

**Justice Permod Kohli:**

*Vide* order dated 03.03.2016, the following directions were issued:-

“(i) The applicant shall be continued on contract basis as had been working earlier and she will be considered for

regular appointment as and when a post falls vacant or 16 post in respect of which approval has been sought from the Government are made available in full or in part.”

2. When this order came to be passed, the petitioner had already reached the age of superannuation on 28.02.2016. Thus, the question of re-engagement and for regular appointment does not arise. In this view of the matter, this Contempt Petition is rendered infructuous. The contempt proceedings are hereby dropped. All the pending ancillary applications also stand disposed of.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is entitled to wages from the date she was discontinued from the service. It is not a question which can be considered in the contempt jurisdiction. If the petitioner has any right which flows from the judgment, she is at liberty to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

**(K.N. Shrivastava)**  
Member (A)

**(Justice Permod Kohli)**  
Chairman

/lg/