

6

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

C.P. No.9 of 2005
IN
O.A. No.1904 of 2003

New Delhi, this the 12th day of July, 2005

**HON'BLE SHRI M.P. SINGH, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE Mrs. MEERA CHHIBBER, MEMBER (J)**

1. Shri M.C. Katiyar,
14/370, Sector-14,
Vasundhara, Ghaziabad (U.P.)
2. Shri M.K. Agrawal
A-183, East Kidwai Nagar,
New Delhi-110023.
3. Shri S.K. Srivastava
B-59, Sector – 56,
Noida.
4. Shri Deepak Yadav,
J-1/166, DDA Flats,
Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019.Applicants.

(Applicant in person though his counsel is absent)

VERSUS

Union of India through,

1. Shri S.K. Tuteja,
Secretary (Food & Public Distribution)
Food and Public Distribution,
Government of India, Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi.Respondents.

(By Advocate : Shri Madhav Panikkar)

ORDER (ORAL)

BY SHRI M.P. SINGH, VICE CHAIRMAN (A) :-

The Tribunal vide order dated 7.5.2004 in OA 1904/2003 passed the following orders:-

“6. As the representation of applicants is still unresponded to, the OA stands disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to consider the claim of the applicants for grant of pay scale of Rs.6500-10500 w.e.f. 1.1.1996 by passing a detailed and reasoned to be passed within a period



of three months from the date of a receipt of a copy of this order. In the event, the claim of applicant is found acceptable, they shall also be entitled to all consequential benefits in accordance with law. No costs."

2. The respondent in pursuance of the aforesaid direction of this Tribunal passed an order dated 28.2.2005.

3. We find that the direction of this Tribunal was to consider the representation of the applicant for the grant of scale of pay of Rs.6500-10500 w.e.f. 1.1.1996 by passing a detailed and reasoned order within a stipulated time. The respondent has complied with the directions of this Tribunal as representation of the applicant is disposed of by a detailed and reasoned order dated 28.2.2005. The respondent has not found the claim of the applicant for the grant of scale of pay of Rs.6500-10500 w.e.f. 1.1.1996 justifiable and rejected the same. Thus, the aforesaid direction given by this Tribunal has been complied with by respondent. Accordingly, Contempt Petition is dismissed. However, the applicant is at liberty to challenge this order, if he still feels aggrieved and so advised. Notice issued to respondent is discharged.

4. MA 287/2005 and MA 553/2005 are also accordingly disposed of.


(Mrs. MEERA CHHIBBER)
MEMBER (J)


(M.P. SINGH)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

/ravi/