

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

**C.P. No. 704/2015 in  
O.A No. 1452/2013**

New Delhi, this the 24<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016

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

Shri Kanwar Singh,  
S/o. Sh. Ami Chand  
Working as Gateman  
Sona Arjunpur, Gate No. 120-B  
Rampur Maniharan  
Distt. Saharanpur,  
R/o. Village Kurali  
Post Rampur Maniharan  
Distt. Saharanpur, U.P.

...Petitioner

(By Advocate: Mr. R. K. Shukla)

Versus

1. Sh. Pradeep Kumar,  
The General Manager,  
Northern Railway,  
Baroda House,  
New Delhi.
2. Sh. A. K. Sachand  
The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Northern Railway, Delhi Division,  
DRM Office, State Entry Road,  
New Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. S. M. Arif)

O R D E R (O R A L)

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

As is evident from the record that the Original Application (O.A) bearing No. 1452/2013, filed by the petitioner, Sh. Kanwar Singh, was allowed vide order dated 15.07.2014, by this Tribunal. The operative part of the order reads as under :-

*“5. In view of the above position, we allow this O.A and direct the respondents to count 50% of the services rendered by the applicant in the capacity as casual*

*labourer and 100% of the service rendered by him in his capacity as temporary status employee for the purpose of pensionary benefits. The aforesaid direction shall be complied with, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”*

6. No order as to costs”

2. According to the petitioner, the respondents have not complied with the direction contained in the order, which necessitated him to file the present Contempt Petition (C.P).

3. In the wake of notice, learned counsel for respondents appeared and placed on record copy of the order dated 14.03.2016, whereby the respondents have already complied with the directions contained in the order of this Tribunal.

4. Therefore, since the respondents have 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 by the order dated 14.03.2016 of the respondents, then, he would be at liberty to file a fresh independent O.A for redressal of his grievances, in accordance with law.

(P. K. Basu)  
Member (A)

(Justice M. S. Sullar)  
Member (J)  
24.10.2016

/Mbt/