

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

CP/310/00014/2019 in OA/310/00383/2018

Dated Monday the 25th day of March Two Thousand Nineteen

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)
HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, Member (J)**

M.Chelladurai,
S/o. S. Muthu,
No. 4/19, 5th Street,
East Banu Nagar,
Pudur, Ambattur,
Chennai 600053.

....Applicant/Applicant

By Advocate M/s. R. Malaichamy

Vs

1.Dr. S. Satheesh Reddy,
The Secretary,
Defence Research and Development Organization,
DRDO Bhavan,
Rajaji Marg, New Delhi 110105.

2.Shri. Sanjay Mitra,
The Defence Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
No. 101-A, South Block,
New Delhi 110011.

3.Shri. V. Balamurugan,
The Director,
Defence Research Development Organization (DRDO),
Combat Vehicle Research and Development Establishment (CVRDE),
Avadi, Chennai 600054.Respondents/Respondents

ORAL ORDER**(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member(A))**

Heard. This CP has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order of this Tribunal dt. 16.03.2018 in OA383/2018.

2. It is submitted that the Tribunal disposed of the applicant's OA 383/2018 by an order dt. 16.03.2018 directing the respondents therein to consider his representation dt. 28.01.2018 along with the legal notice dt. 31.12.2018 in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, the respondents passed an order dt. 03.07.2018 stating that the claim for payment of provisional pension and gratuity could be processed by the department subject to fulfilment of the requirement by the individual for the basic pay of Rs. 18380 + GP Rs. 4600/- as on the date of superannuation ie. 31.07.2014.

3. It is contended that the disposal of the representation in this manner was objectionable as the respondents were directed to take a decision on the applicant's representation which had not been done. Further, even after such order, provisional pension has not been granted to the applicant till date.

4. On perusal, it is seen that the order dt. 03.07.2018 has been passed by the respondent in alleged compliance of the order of this Tribunal in OA 383/2018 dt. 16.03.2018. If the applicant is not satisfied with the same, it is for him to

challenge this order in a separate OA. No contempt would lie against such order merely because the applicant's representation had not been disposed of in a manner favourable to him.

5. CP is dismissed.

(P. Madhavan)
Member(J)

(R. Ramanujam)
Member(A)

25.03.2019

SKSI