

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 170/00047/2017

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 170/00927/2016

DATED THIS THE 09TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017

HON'BLE DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER (J)

HON'BLE SHRI PRASANNA KUMAR PRADHAN, MEMBER (A)

Venkataramana Naika,
Aged about 62 years,
(Retd) UDC
R/o # 281, 2/5 Main Road,
6th Cross, "I" Block,
Ramakrishna Nagar,
Mysore – 560 023

... Petitioner

(By Advocate Shri N. Obalappa)

Vs.

1. Shri Ajay Mittal, Secretary,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
'A' Wing, Shastry Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2. Shri Rajeev Sharma,
Chief Executive Officer,
Prasar Bharati Secretariat,
Doordarshan Bhavan,
Tower 'C', Mandi House,
Copernicus Marg, New Delhi – 110 001.

3. Smt. Supriya Sahu, IAS,
Director General, Doordarshan,
Doordarshan Bhavan,
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi – 110 001.

4. Shri N. Chandrashekhar,
Deputy Director General (P),
Doordarshan Kendra,
J.C. Nagar, Bangalore – 560 006.

5. Smt. Vijayalakshmi,
The Pay & Accounts Officer,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Swami Sivananda Salai,
Chennai – 600 004.

...Respondents

(By Shri M.V. Rao, Senior Panel Counsel)

ORDER (ORAL)

DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER (J):

In the contempt application, a submission is made by Shri Obalappa, learned counsel appearing for the original applicant, that in the Contempt Petition the Hon'ble High Court had issued a stay. Since this is covered by a hundred different Hon'ble Supreme Court judgments, we beg to differ from this issue. But then Shri M.V. Rao, learned counsel for the respondents, made it clear that it is not an order passed in contempt but an order passed against the original order, which the Hon'ble High Court is entitled to as per Chandra Kumar judgment. When a counsel makes such statement, it destroys the comity of the institution. Therefore we had once again queried repeatedly and elicited an answer that an order was passed against the original order alone and it has nothing to do with the Contempt Petition. This sort of misrepresentation will create unnecessary issues in justice delivery system.

2. Therefore the Contempt Petition is dismissed with liberty. Notices are discharged.

(PRASANNA KUMAR PRADHAN)

(DR. K.B. SURESH)

MEMBER (A)

MEMBER (J)

/ksk/

Annexures referred to by the petitioner in CP No. 170/00047/2017

Annexure-C1: True copy of judgment in OA No. 170/00927/2016 dated 23.01.2017 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore Bench

Annexure-C2: True copy of representation of the applicant dated 06.02.2017 addressed to the 4th respondent.
