

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
CHANDIGARH BENCH

C.P.No.060/00091/2016 in
O.A.NO.060/00363/2014

Decided on: 24.07.2018

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J) &
HON'BLE MS. AJANTA DAYALAN, MEMBER (A)**

Sukhdev Singh son of Shri Jaswant Singh, aged 54, Group A,
Joint Director of Training,
O/O The Director General of Employment and Training,
Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship,
Shivaji Stadium, New Delhi
resident of Kirpal House, 465, Phase II,
Urban Estate, Patiala 147001.

Applicant

By: Dr. G.K.S. Taank, Advocate.

Versus

1. Sh. B.P. Sharma, the Secretary, Government of India,
Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship,
Shivaji Stadium,
New Delhi.
2. Sh. K.P. Krishanan, Secretary, Department of Personnel,
Pensions and Public Grievances, Government of India, New Delhi.
3. Sh. T. Jacob, Secretary, Union Public Service Commission,
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.

...

Respondents

By : Mr. R.L.Gupta, Counsel for Respondent No.2
Mr. B.B. Sharma, Counsel for Respondent No.3.

O R D E R (oral)
HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. The petitioner had filed the instant Contempt Petition against the respondents for non-compliance of the order dated 20.1.2016, Annexure P-1, vide which respondents were to hold review DPC to consider the case of the petitioner for promotion as Joint Director from 2002 onwards etc. with all the consequential benefits.
2. Mr. Gupta, learned counsel for Respondent No.2 submits that the order of this Tribunal has since been complied with and the applicant has been given promotion as Joint Director from due date i.e. 28.6.2007 (Annexure MA-R-2) and then as Director with effect from 27.12.2011 vide order dated 12.6.2018 (Annexure MA R-4), and as such this C.P. may be closed as having been satisfied.
3. However, learned counsel for the applicant submits that he does not dispute about the promotion orders, but the respondents have not given difference of pay and allowances to the applicant, consequent upon aforesaid two promotions and the applicant already stands retired w.e.f. 30.5.2018, including retiral benefits based on higher pay and allowances.
4. Learned counsel for Respondent No.2 states that the respondents may be granted two weeks' time so that the authorities are able to disburse the actual difference of pay and allowances, if there is nothing against the applicant, and also to determine and release retiral dues of the applicant, who has since retired on 31.5.2018. Allowed.
5. Since the respondents have carried out substantial compliance of the order of this Tribunal, this C.P. is closed, but with the

observations, as above, with an expectation that the respondents would honour their commitment, of releasing the due benefits within a period of two weeks.

6. However, if the respondents fail to honour their undertaking, as recorded above, the petitioner would be at liberty to file an application for necessary compliance.

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

(AJANTA DAYALAN)
MEMBER (A)

Place : Chandigarh.
Dated: 24.07.2018

HC*

