

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

C.P. No. 326/2016
O.A. No. 3336/2015

New Delhi, this the 3rd day of November, 2016.

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

Rakesh Chandra Srivastava,
(Aged about 61 years),
Retired Vice Principal,
Go.Co-Ed, S.S. School, Baprola,
S/o Late Shri Devi Saran Srivastava,
R/o RZ-G-28, Deva Kunj,
Raj Nagar, Part-II,
Palam Colony,
New Delhi-110045.

.. Petitioner

(By Advocate : Nemo)

Versus

1. Mrs. Kamlesh Kaur Chauhan,
Deputy Director of Education,
Zone West B,
Dept. of Education,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
G-Block, Vikas Puri,
New Delhi-110018.

2. Mrs. Saumya Gupta,
Director of Education,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Old Secretariat,
New Delhi-110054.

.. respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Vijay Pandita)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice M.S. Sullar, Member (J)

Nemo for the petitioner.

2. A bare perusal of the record would reveal that O.A. bearing No.3336/2015 filed by the petitioner, Shri Rakesh Chandra Srivastava, was disposed of vide order dated 16.05.2016 by this Tribunal. The operative part of the order reads as under:

“9. Taking into account the aforementioned facts and for the reasons discussed, we quash and set aside the order dated 30.01.2015 of respondent No.1, imposing the penalty of censure on the applicant. The order dated 19.05.2015, by which the representation of the applicant for re-employment till the age of 62 years was rejected because of the imposition of minor penalty of censure on him, is also quashed. The respondents are directed to consider his representation for reemployment in accordance with the rules governing the scheme without being influenced by the penalty of censure awarded to him earlier. This may be done within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. No costs.”

3. According to the petitioner, the respondents have not complied with the directions contained in the order of this Tribunal, which necessitated him to file the instant Contempt Petition (CP).

4. In the wake of notice, learned counsel for the respondents appeared and has placed on record the compliance report along with copy of order dated 05.08.2016 (Annexure R-2), by virtue of which the respondents have complied with the order of this Tribunal.

5. As the respondents have already substantially complied with the indicated directions, so no further action is required to be taken in the matter. Perhaps that is the reason that nobody is appearing on behalf of the petitioner from the last two dates.

6. Therefore, the CP is hereby dismissed and rule of contempt is accordingly discharged.

Needless to mention that in case the petitioner still remains aggrieved by the order dated 05.08.2016 (Annexure R-2), he would be at liberty to file an independent O.A. to challenge its validity, in accordance with law.

(P.K. BASU)
Member (A)

(JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR)
Member (J)
03.11.2016

/Jyoti/