

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

**CP No.284/2019
RA No.136/2018
OA No.3537/2017**

New Delhi, this the 1st day of July, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed Ahmed, Member (A)**

Rama Kant Sharma "Udbhrant"
Retired Sr. Director of Programme
DG: Doordarshan, New Delhi
R/o B-463, Kendriya Vihar
Sector-51, Noida 201 301. Applicant.

(Applicant in person)

Vs.

1. Amit Khare
Secretary
Ministry of I & B
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi 110 001.
2. Shashi Vekhar Vempati
CEO, Prasar Bharati
Doordarshan Bhawan,
Copernicus Road,
New Delhi 110 001. ... Respondents.

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:

This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the directions issued by this Tribunal in its order dated 05.08.2018 passed in RA No.136/2018 in OA No.3537/2017.

2. We heard the applicant who argued his case in person.

3. The OA was filed challenging a charge memorandum dated 11.03.2013 by raising several grounds. Through a detailed order dated 10.07.2018, we dismissed the OA. RA No.136/2018 was filed by raising certain pleas. The RA was dismissed vide order dated 05.10.2018. It was, however, observed that if the applicant makes a request for furnishing documents during the course of inquiry, the respondents shall either furnish them, or inform in writing as to why they cannot be furnished.

4. Dealing with the various requests made by the applicant, the Inquiry Officer passed an order dated 31.10.2018. It was the 32nd hearing in the inquiry. The applicant contends that he made a request to furnish the certified copy of the original complaint, the CEO's direction or advise on the note dated 16.02.2010, and file notings on the action taken after the CEO's direction dated 01.01.2010 and 11.01.2010. All these aspects were dealt with by the Inquiry Officer in his detailed order dated 31.10.2018. According to the applicant, the view taken by the Inquiry Officer does not conform to the directions issued by this Tribunal. We do not accept the contention of the applicant at all. The various pleas taken by the applicant disclose

that he is determined to cause obstruction in the inquiry on one pretext or the other.

5. We do not find merit in the contempt case. The same is accordingly closed.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/pj/

