

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.060/00140/2018 IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.060/00695/2018**

Chandigarh, this the 22nd day of January, 2019

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

Deepanjali Pal Singh

aged about 43 years,

w/o Vijay Pal Singh

R/o House No. 3318/B, Sector 24-D,
Chandigarh, Pin Code- 160023.

Group B

....Petitioner

(Present: Ms. Neha Sonawane, Advocate)

Versus

1. Sh. B.L. Sharma,
Secretary, Education Department,
UT Secretariat, Sector 9,
Chandigarh, Pin Code – 160009.
2. Sh. Rubinderjit Singh Brar, PCS,
Director School Education,
UT Secretariat, Sector 9,
Chandigarh, Pin Code – 160009.

..... Respondents

(Present: Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate)

ORDER (Oral)
SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. The present CP has been filed alleging non compliance of order dated 01.06.2018, whereby a direction was given to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.
2. In response to show cause notice, the respondents have filed affidavit wherein they have informed that the petitioner has raised finger against some of the selected candidates on certain grounds, including that they are not eligible for promotion as they possess fake degrees or invalid qualification. It is further submitted that to verify the contentions raised by the petitioner, the respondents have constituted a committee vide order dated 28.08.2018 to enquire into the matter, and that based upon report, to be submitted by this Committee, they would be able to take a view on the representation of the petitioner, as directed by this Court.
3. Mr. Arvind Moudgil, learned counsel for the respondents argued that the respondents, to comply with the order of this Court, have started the relevant process and thus, there is no intentional and deliberate contempt on their part. Therefore, the present CP may be dismissed and notices be discharged.
4. Considering the above, we are in agreement with the learned counsel for the respondents that they could decide the representation of the petitioner only after having a report from the Committee constituted to verify the correctness and validity of the degrees/qualification of the persons, pointed out by the petitioner in his representation, and there is no deliberate non-compliance of the order of this Court. However, we feel that the ends of justice

would meet if a direction is issued to the respondents to get the proceedings concluded expeditiously, in any case, not later than three months. Ordered accordingly.

5. The C.P. is, accordingly, dismissed. Notices stand discharged. However, the petitioner is at liberty to seek revival of the CP, if needful is not done within the time granted.

(P. GOPINATH)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Dated: 22.01.2019

‘mw’

