

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

**C.P. No. 380/2016 in
O.A No. 3319/2015**

New Delhi, this the 24th day of October, 2016

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

1. Gaje Singh (Mali)
S/o. Shri Ram Singh,
R/o. Q-171, Mohan Garden, Delhi.

2. Mohan Singh (Chowkidar)
S/o. Shri Mangal Singh,
R/o. E-116, Bharat Vihar,
Begam Pur, Delhi.

..Petitioners

(By Advocate : Mr. Kartar Singh)

VERSUS

1. Sh. P. K. Gupta
Commissioner (North) MCD,
Civic Center, Minto Road, New Delhi.

2. Sh. Nanak Chand
The Deputy Director, (Horticulture),
Municipal Corporation of Delhi,
Rohini Zone, Delhi.

....Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Manjeet Singh Reen)

O R D E R (O R A L)

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

A perusal of the record would reveal that the Original Application (O.A) bearing No. 3319/2015, filed by the petitioners, Sh. Gaje Singh & Anr., was disposed of vide order dated 17.12.2015, by this Tribunal. The operative part of the order reads as under :-

“3. Having regard to the aforesaid submissions advanced, the O.A stands disposed of in terms of the directions contained in the aforesaid above two orders passed in aforesaid O.As. The respondents no. 1 & 2 shall

pass a reasoned order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

4. O.A, accordingly, stands disposed of. No costs."

2. According to the petitioners, the respondents have not complied with the directions contained in the order, which necessitated them 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 compliance report and copy of the detailed order dated 22.09.2016, by virtue of which, the representations of the petitioners were considered and decided by the respondents. 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.

4. Therefore, the C.P is accordingly closed. The rule of Contempt is discharged. No costs.

5. Needless to mention, in case the petitioners still remain aggrieved by the order dated 22.09.2016 of the respondents, then, they would be at liberty to file a fresh independent O.A for redressal of their grievances, in accordance with law.

(P. K. Basu)
Member (A)

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

/Mbt/