

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**C.P. No. 718/2015
O.A. No. 1336/1997**

New, Delhi, This the 8th day of January, 2016.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. P. Katakey, Member (J)
Hon'ble Shri K. N. Shrivastava, Member (A)

Shri Rattan Lal Rai Das,
C/o. Dr. Hans Raj Bhawan,
Karampur Bazar, Dehradun,
Uttarakhand.

.....Petitioner

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

Versus

Sh. R. N. Kumar,
The Principal Controller
Defence Accounts (Air Force)
Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

...Respondent

O R D E R (O R A L)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. P. Katekey, Member (J)

Heard Mr. R. K. Shukla, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner has filed this Contempt Petition alleging wilful and deliberate violation of the direction contained in the order dated 20.04.2000 passed in O.A No. 1336/1997 contending inter alia that despite the direction issued the interest payable at the rate of 12% per annum as directed to be paid on the C.A and gratuity has not been paid.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that despite making the representation by him, in terms of the order dated 16.10.2000 passed in C.P 295/2000, the said interest payable has not been paid. The learned counsel, therefore, submits that the respondents have committed contempt of this Tribunal.

4. It appears that by the aforesaid order dated 20.04.2000 passed in O.A No. 1336/1997 direction was issued in the following terms :-

“We direct the respondents to pay interest to the applicant at the rate of 12% on the arrears of CA w.e.f. 01.10.74 and on the gratuity. This shall be complied with within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

5. The applicant, thereafter, filed C.P. No. 295/2000 before this Tribunal, which was disposed of vide order dated 16.10.2000 allowing the applicant to make a representation before the authority with the further observations that the respondents authority will certainly look into such representation and correct any mistake committed by them. The applicant could not produce the proof of making any such representation before the authority.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation before the authority.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid position, we are of the view that no contempt has been committed by the respondents. The petitioner, however, is given liberty to file the representation before the respondent authority and in the event of making such representation the respondents will certainly look into the grievance of the applicant and pass necessary order.

8. The Contempt Petition stands closed. No costs.

(K. N. Shrivastava)
Member (A)

(Justice B.P. Katakey)
Member (J)

/Mbt/