

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

**Contempt Petition No. 60/0034/2018 &
M.A. NO. 60/00398/2018 in
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 060/00737/2016****Chandigarh, this the 17th day of January, 2019**

...

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

...

Rakesh Mohan Gupta son of Sh. A.N. Garg, aged about 57 years,
resident of Flat No. 1203, Progressive Enclave, Sector 50-B,
Chandigarh.

....Petitioner

(By Advocate: Shri Amit Gupta)

VERSUS

1. Rajiv Gauba, IAS, Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Cabinet Secretariat, Raisina Hill, New Delhi.
2. Rajiv Jain, IPS, Director, Intelligence Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, North Block Complex, New Delhi.

....RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: Shri Sanjay Goyal)

ORDER (oral)**SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)**

The present Contempt Petition has been filed alleging deliberate disobedience on the part of respondents in not complying with the order of this Tribunal dated 20.11.2017 passed in O.A. No. 060/00737/2016,

2. Mr. Goyal, learned counsel for respondents today produced a copy of communication dated 16.1.2019 addressed to him by the respondent department wherein he has been informed that after the order passed by this Tribunal the case of the petitioner was considered for promotion to the post of Assistant Director/NP and

he stands promoted as such. Consequent to re-fixation of his seniority in the rank of Assistant Director, a review DPC would be convened by the UPSC for his next promotion as Joint Deputy Director. Therefore, learned counsel for respondents submit that respondents be granted 2 months time for convening the DPC.

3. Considering the fact that the respondents in compliance with the orders of this Tribunal, have taken action and promoted the petitioner to the post of Assistant Director and are going to convene a DPC meeting for further promotion as Joint Deputy Director, therefore, they are granted further 45 days time from today to convene that meeting. As such, there is no deliberate disobedience on the part of respondents. The C.P. is closed. Notice is discharged. Pending M.A. also stands disposed of. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive this C.P. if the respondents do not convene meeting of the DPC as recorded above.

(P.GOPINATH)
MEMBER (A)

(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Dated: 17.01.2019

‘SK’

