

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI****C.P. No.774/2015 In  
O.A No.1735/2013****New Delhi, this the 7<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016****Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. K. N. Shrivastava, Member (A)**

Ms. Pallavi Tandon, ITS  
Aged 45 years (DOB being 18.03.1968)  
Daughter of Shri Shiv Gopal Tandon  
Presently serving as Director Telecom, TEC  
Department of Telecommunications  
Ministry of Communication, Information  
& Technology  
Government of India, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, TERM CELL,  
CTO Building, Jaistamb Chowk, Raipur, C.G-492001  
(Address for communication: C/o Mrs. Urmila  
Kapoor, B-3, 35-B, Lawrence Road,  
Keshavpuram Metro, Delhi – 110035. ....Petitioner

(Argued by: Ms. Shabnam Parvin with Ms. Ishita Baruah)

**Versus**

1. Shri Rakesh Garg,  
Secretary to the Government of India,  
Ministry of Communications & Information  
Technology  
Department of Telecommunications  
Government of India, Room No.1009  
Sanchar Bhavan, 20 Ashoka Road  
New Delhi – 110001.
2. Shri Surendra Mohan  
Director,  
Satarkta Bhavan, GPO Complex  
Block-A, I.N.A., New Delhi – 110023.
3. Shri Ashim Khurana  
Secretary,  
UPSC, Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road  
New Delhi – 110069.
4. Shri Anupam Shrivastava  
Chairman-cum-M.D.  
BSNL, Bharat Sanchar Bhavan

H.C. Mathur Lane, Janpath  
New Delhi-110001.

5. Shri M. Akshay  
Chief Vigilance Officer,  
Department of Telecommunications  
Government of India, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sanchar Bhavan, 20 Ashoka Road  
New Delhi – 110001. ... Respondents

(By advocate : Shri H.K.Gangwani for Respondent Nos.  
1,2 & 3.

Shri V.P. Sharma for Respondent No.4 &  
Shri Shailendra Tiwari for Respondent  
No.5).

### **ORDER (ORAL)**

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

The Original Application (OA) No.1735/2013 filed by applicant, Ms. Pallavi Tandon, was allowed vide order dated 08.01.2015 by this Tribunal. The operative part of this order is as under:-

“26. In the above facts and circumstances of the case, we allow this OA and quash and set aside the (i) Annexure A-1 Office Memorandum No.007/P&T/066-3256 dated 06.02.2008 issued by the Chief Vigilance Commission, New Delhi, (ii) Annexure A-2 Memorandum dated No.8/60/2009-Vig.II dated 10.12.2009 issued by the President through the Department of Telecom., Government of India, New Delhi, (iii) Annexure A-3 Advice bearing No.F.3/10/2012-SI dated 08.06.2012 issued by UPSC, New Delhi and (iv) Annexure A-4 Order of penalty bearing No.8/60/2009-Vig.II dated 03.09.2012 issued by the President through the Department of Telecom., Government of India, New Delhi. Consequently, we direct the Respondents to restore the pay of the Applicant as it was obtaining prior to passing of the impugned order of penalty, with all consequential benefits including the grant of promotion to the next higher post at par with the Applicant’s immediate junior etc., if she is otherwise found eligible. We also direct the Respondents to carry out the aforesaid order/directions, within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order”.

2. Now the petitioner has preferred the instant Contempt Petition (CP) on the ground that since the respondents have not complied with the directions contained in the order, so

they are liable to be punished under the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

3. In the wake of notices, the respondents-contemnors appeared and filed the compliance report by way of affidavit of K.P. Singh, Deputy CCS (Legal), wherein it was mentioned that respondents have already complied with the indicated directions and passed order dated 22.03.2016 (Annexure R-I) in this regard.

4. A bare perusal of the compliance report and order Annexure R-I, would reveal that the respondents have already complied with the directions contained in the order dated 08.01.2015 passed by this Tribunal. Moreover, the learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly acknowledged that the order passed by the Tribunal has since been complied, so no further action is required to be taken in the matter.

5. In the light of the aforesaid reasons, the CP is dismissed. Rule discharged. No costs.

**(K.N. SHRIVASTAVA)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**Rakesh**