

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**CP No.509/2018 in OA No.3091/2016**

New Delhi, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018

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

Rakesh Kumar Gupta, Age 53 years  
S/o Late Shri Kanhaiya Lal Gupta  
R/o 30/LG-1, Teachers Apartment, Block-A  
Dilshad Colony, Delhi-110095. ..Applicant

(Wife of the applicant on his behalf)

Versus

1. Dr. M.M. Kutty, Previous Chief Secretary  
GNCT Delhi, O/o A-Wing, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Delhi Secretariat, I.P. Estate  
New Delhi-110002.
2. Smt. Saumya Gupta, Previous Director of  
Education, Through Shri Sanjay Goel, Present  
Director of Education, GNCT of Delhi  
O/o Director of Education, GNCT Delhi  
Room No.12, Old Secretariat  
Delhi-110054.
3. Smt. Padmini Singla  
Earlier Director of Education, GNCTD  
O/o The Director of Education GNCTD  
Room No.12, Old Secretariat  
Delhi-110054.
4. Shri Sanjay Goel, Director of Education GNCTD  
O/o The Director of Education GNCTD  
Room No.12, Old Secretariat  
Delhi-110054. ..Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Ramesh Shukla for Ms. Harvinder Oberoi)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:-**

This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the directions issued by this Tribunal in OA No.3091/2016 through Order dated 02.08.2017. A perusal of the said Order discloses that the only relief granted therein is that the representation dated 14.08.2015 submitted by the applicant be disposed of within three months.

2. This Contempt Petition is filed by the applicant in person. However, the applicant is not present. On his behalf, a representation is made that he is not well.

3. We have perused the record to examine whether any relief can be granted to the applicant. There are several hundreds of cases that are filed by the applicant. The common pattern is that he sends e-mail to the respondents. Stating that his e-mail is not responded, he files an OA. The Tribunal passes order directing disposal of the representation sent through e-mail. Then a contempt case is filed stating that the order is not complied with. The respondents pass an

order under fear of contempt. That order in turn is challenged in another O.A. The chain goes on.

4. This is one such representation wherein the applicant has asked the respondents to furnish the 'action taken report' and 'redressal report'. However, the actual subject matter is not disclosed. Unless the applicant is clear in his representation, there is not much that one can expect from the respondents in reply. Therefore, we close the contempt case, leaving it open to the applicant to make a detailed representation clearly mentioning the relief which he wants from the respondents with reference to his service. We make it clear that if the representation is vague or unambiguous or general in nature, the respondents would not be under obligation to deal with it.

5. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Pradeep Kumar)**  
**Member(A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/vb/