

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**CP No.419/2019  
In  
OA No.4011/2012**

New Delhi, this the 4<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

1. Shri Pratap Singh,  
Aged about 68 years,  
S/o late Devi Singh,  
R/o. 74/C, Pocket-A,  
Mayur Vihar, Phase-2,  
New Delhi.
2. Shri Sanjay Kumar,  
Aged about 52 years,  
S/o. Sh. Ram Parkash,  
R/o. D-292, Ganga Vihar,  
New Delhi – 110094.
3. Shri K. L. Sikka,  
Aged about 68 years,  
S/o. Late Hem Raj,  
R/o. 304, Saral Apartment,  
Plot No. 15, Sector-10,  
Dwarka, New Delhi.
4. Sh. Ashok Kumar,  
Aged about 59 years,  
S/o Late Ram Prasad,  
R/o. H. No. 183, Sector-1,  
R.K. Puram, New Delhi-22.
5. Sh. Amal Dutta Gupta,  
Aged about 65 years,  
S/o Late I. C. Gupta,  
R/o H3/32, Mahavir Enclave,  
New Delhi.
6. Sh. Vinod Kumar,  
Aged about 48 years,  
S/o. Sh. R. B. Naithani,

R/o. Qtr. No. 1683,  
Sector-5, R. K. Puram,  
New Delhi.

7. Sh. Saleem Ahamad,  
Aged about 50 years,  
S/o Late Mehmood Hasan,  
R/o B-320, Street No.13/4,  
Subhash Nagar, North Ghonda,  
New Delhi.
8. Sh. P.L. Meena,  
Aged about 55 years,  
S/o P. D. Meena  
R/o 14, North West Moti Bagh,  
New Delhi.

...Applicants

(By Advocate : Shri S.K. Gupta )

**Versus**

1. Sh. Darga Shankar Mishra,  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Sh. Ritu Sain,  
Director,  
Directorate of Estate,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Sh. Girish Chander Marmu,  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Finance,  
Department of Expenditure,  
North Block, New Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Ms Aishwarya Dobhal for Shri Hilal  
Haider)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :-**

The applicants filed OA No.4011/2012 feeling aggrieved by the order dated 16.4.2012 in the context of implementation of the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission for the post of Assistant and Section Officer, in the un-organized accounts cadre of Directorate of Estates. The OA was allowed through order dated 13.12.2018 and the impugned order was set aside. Specific directions were issued to the respondents to pass fresh orders, without taking into account any external factors and strictly in accordance with the rules reflecting the recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

2. This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not implement the directions issued in the OA. The applicants, however, stated that the order dated 28.06.2019, passed by the respondents stating to be in compliance with the order in the OA, is totally inadequate and contrary to the specific directions issued in the OA.

3. We heard Shri S.K. Gupta, learned counsel for applicant and Ms. Aishwarya Dobhal for Shri Hilal Haider, learned counsel for respondents.

4. The OA was allowed by indicating clear reasons. Directions were issued that exercise shall be undertaken by excluding any external factors. The respondents passed order dated 28.06.2019. The applicants vehemently contend that the concerned authority totally ignored the directions and observations made by the Tribunal. We are of the view that such a micro analysis is not possible in the contempt proceedings. The only alternative for the applicants would be to file the OA challenging the order dated 28.06.2019, if they are so advised.

5. The CP is, accordingly, closed.

Pending MAs, if any, stand disposed of.

( Pradeep Kumar )  
Member (A)

( Justice L. Narasimha Reddy )  
Member (J)

‘rk’