

(6)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

C.P. No.351 OF 2003

IN

O.A. No.241 OF 2003

New Delhi, this the 25th day of February, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI R.K. UPADHYAYA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE SHRI BHARAT BHUSHAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

1. Sultan Singh Negi,
S/o Shri Bagh Singh,
Asstt. Cook,
Diesel Training Hostel, Diesel Shed,
Tughlakabad.

r/o Sihadpur Village,
P.O. Tipet
Faridabad.

2. Satya Narayan Mandal
S/o Late Shri Neel Kanth Mandal,
RR Bearer
Diesel Training Hostel, Diesel Shed,
Tughlakabad.

R/o 301, Bhatta Colony,
Sihadpur,
P.O. Tilpet,
Faridabad.

3. Ashok Kumar,
s/o Shri Anant Ramnath,
RR Bearer
Diesel Training Hostel, Diesel Shed,
Tughlakabad.

R/o Qr. No.25,
South Avenue,
New Delhi.

.....Petitioners

(By Advocate : Shri K.N.R. Pillai)

Versus

Shri V.K. Aggarwal,
Divisional Railway Manager,
Delhi Division Northern Railway,
State Entry Road,
New Delhi-110 001.

.....Respondent

(By Advocate : Shri V.S.R. Krishna with
Shri Ashwani Bharwaj)

ORDER (ORAL)

SHRI R.K. UPADHYAYA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER :

Heard Shri K.N.R. Pillai, learned counsel of
the applicants/petitioners and Shri V.S.R. Krishan

C. N. R. Pillai

(7)

(2)

with Shri Ashwani Bhardwaj, learned counsel of the respondents.

2. It is stated by the respondents that the order of this Tribunal dated 31.1.2003 in OA 241/2003 has been complied with. By the said order, this Tribunal had directed respondent NO.2 to consider the representation of the applicant and to pass a speaking order within a period of four months.

3. It is stated by the respondents that the order was already passed on 23.6.20003 but somehow the same was not communicated to the applicant, therefore, in compliance of the order of this Tribunal dated 31.1.2003, another order has been passed on 10.12.2003. According to the learned counsel of the respondents the order of the Tribunal has been complied with. In any case, the applicant is still aggrieved of the orders passed in compliance of the Tribunal's directions, it gives the applicant a fresh cause of action, which may be separately contested by the applicant, if so advised.


4. After hearing the learned counsel of both the parties and after perusal of the material available on record, we are of the view that the present Contempt Petition need not be pursued in view of the compliance order passed by the respondents on 10.12.2003. In case, the applicant


Amrinder Singh

8

(3)

still feels aggrieved by the order, it would be open for him to contest the same in separate proceeding in accordance with law. So far as this Contempt Petition is concerned, the same is disposed of and notice issued is discharged..


(BHARAT BHUSHAN)
JUDICIAL MEMBER


(R.K. UPADHYAYA)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

/ravi/