

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

**CP No.143/2018
In
OA No.225/2017
MA No.1940/2018**

New Delhi, this the 27th day of August, 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

Rakesh Kumar Gupta
([VH] EMP, ID 19900636)
Vice Principal under Suspension,
S/o Late Shri Kanhaiya Lal Gupta,
Aged 53 years,
R/o 30/LG-1, Teachers Apartment,
Block-A, Dilshad Colony,
Delhi-110095.

...Applicant
(None)

Versus

1. Shri Vijay Kumar
(Secretary to Lt. Governor GNCT Delhi),
O/o Lt. Governor's Secretariat,
GNCT Delhi,
Raj Niwas Marg,
Delhi-110054.
2. Dr. M.M. Kutty
(Previous Chief Secretary GNCT Delhi),
Through Shri Anshu Prakash
(Present Chief Secretary GNCT Delhi).
O/o A-Wing, 5th Floor, Delhi Secretariat,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002.
3. Smt. Saumya Gupta,
(Director of Education GNCT Delhi),
O/o The Director of Education,
GNCT Delhi,
Room No.12, Old Secretariat,
Delhi-110054.

4. Shri Lala Ram Bharti,
(Emp. ID 19790362 [Retired] & X Principal
Of HOS of GBSSS, New Seemapuri,
Delhi,
R/o C-26, Swarn Nagri, Greater Noida,
Gautam Budh Nagar-201306 (U.P.).
5. Shri Parveen Kumar (Vice Principal Present HOS &DDO),
O/o GBSSS (School ID 1106011),
New Seemapuri, Delhi-110095

...Respondents.

(By Advocate : Shri G.D. Chawla for Ms. Harvinder Oberoi)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :-

The applicant filed the OA No.225/2017, with a prayer to direct the respondents to pass orders on his representation dated 19.12.2015. The OA was disposed of on 19.01.2017, directing the respondents to pass orders on said representation within a period of three months. This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not comply with the orders of this Tribunal issued. In the OA, the applicant had also filed MA No.1940/2018, almost complaining that the Tribunal is passing orders without ensuring proper replies from the respondents, as provided under Rule 12(4) of the Central Administrative Tribunal

(Procedure) Rules, 1987, and that henceforth, the Tribunal shall comply with the same.

2. The applicant filed this case in person but did not attend today. We heard the learned counsel for respondents and perused the record.

3. The record discloses that an order was passed on 23.10.2017 by the respondents in compliance of the order dated 19.01.2017 in OA No.225/2017. A perusal of the same reveals that the applicant made a representation as regards the payment of salary for the period. He has been issued a memorandum dated 03.12.2015, requiring certain information. Ultimately, representation has been replied to by the respondents on 23.10.2017. Hence, it cannot be said that there was any non-compliance on the part of the respondents.

4. Before parting with the contempt case, we are compelled to make certain observations. The applicant is appointed as a teacher and at present he is Vice Principal in a School under the Delhi Government. On a conservative estimate, he is said to have filed about 300 to 400 cases on one pretext or the other and all of them, in

person. Since he happens to be visually handicapped, the Tribunal has showed indulgence and tried to address his grievances. However, there is no end to the type of e-mails sent by him and the consequential proceedings initiated before this Tribunal. Substantial time of the Education Department is devoted to deal with the representations and cases filed by the applicant. We hope that applicant would devote his attention to duties rather than keeping the department and the Tribunal busy with all unnecessary and trivial matters.

5. The contempt case is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)
'rk'

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman