

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

**C.P. No. 213/2019 In  
O.A No. 3827/2016**

New Delhi, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Mrs. Meetali Bahl  
R/o. B-61, Ramdutt Enclave,  
Uttam Nagar, New Delhi-110 059. ....Petitioner

(By Advocate : Mr. Shrigopal Aggarwal)

Versus

Sh. Shekhar C. Mande  
Chairman, CDC  
(Secretary DSIR)  
M/o. Science and Technology  
Technology Bhavan,  
New Mehrauli Road,  
New Delhi – 16. ....Respondent

(By Advocate : Mr. Aamir Khan for Mr. Hanu Bhaskar)

O R D E R (O R A L)

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

The applicant filed O.A 3827/2016 challenging the order through which the respondents refused to extend her contract. After hearing both the parties, the O.A was allowed on 06.02.2019. The order impugned in the O.A was set aside and the first respondent i.e., Chairman of CDC was directed to pass a fresh order, on the representation made by the applicant, as regards the evaluation of her performance for 3 years, i.e., 2012-13,

2013-14 and 2014-15, within four weeks. This C.P. is filed alleging that the respondents have not complied with the orders of this Tribunal.

2. We heard Mr. Shrigopal Aggarwal, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Aamir Khan for Mr. Hanu Bhaskar, learned counsel for respondents.

3. The C.P. has undergone several stages. On one occasion, we expressed our displeasure about the manner in which the order, stated to be in compliance with the orders of the Tribunal was passed. Today, the respondents placed before us, a copy of the order dated 23.05.2019. In the said order, the Chairman has directed that the gradation given by the reviewing officer for the 3 years of service of the applicant be ignored and the one, given by the reporting officer for that period, be taken as valid. The result is that ACRs of the applicant for three years are elevated to the level of "Very Good".

4. In view of the order dated 23.05.2019, the impediment of the renewal of the contract of the applicant ceases to exist. However, the applicant who is present in the Court stated that she is not interested in serving the respondents organisation. The only issue left over is the settlement of the dues such as gratuity, leave encashment

etc. We leave it open to the applicant to make a representation on this behalf and the respondents in turn shall take necessary steps, at the earliest. Accordingly the C.P. is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)  
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)  
Chairman

/Mbt/