

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
(CIRCUIT BENCH AT SHIMLA)**

...

C.P.NO.063/00093/2019 in
O.A.No.063/00926/2017

Decided on: 08.11.2019

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J) &
HON'BLE MR. MOHD. JAMSHED, MEMBER (A)**

...

1. Khem Raj Verma S/o Late Sh. Moti Ram, R/o Village Sainjari, P.O.Sainj, Tehsil Suni, Distt. Shimla, H.P.-171301.
2. Pushap Lal S/o Late Sh. Hira Lal Sharma, r/o IIAs Colony, Block-C, Room No. 68-69, Boileauganj, Shimla, H.P. 171005.
3. Saroj Devi W/o Sh. Sushil Kumar, r/o House No. 7-8, Barighat Line, Near Advance Study, Chaura Maidan, Distt. Shimla H.P. 171004.
4. Smt. Savita Devi W/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, r/o Quarter No. 26-27, Military Barack No. 1, IIAS R.P. Niwas, Shimla, H.P. 171005.
5. Som Prakash S/o Sh. Chander Pal, r/o Set No.1, Transit House, Bilaspur House, Lower Summer Hill, Shimla, H.P. 171005.
6. Jitender Singh S/o Sh. Pyare Lal, R/o care of Beli Ram Niwas, Village Frood, P.O. Kamlangar, Lower Cementary, Sanjauli, Shimla-171006, H.P.

Petitioners/Applicants

**(BY: MR. SANJEEV BHUSHAN, SR. ADVOCATE, WITH
MR. RAJESH KUMAR, ADVOCATE)**

Versus

1. Mr. R. Subramanyam, Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, room No. 127-C Wing, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110015.
2. Mr. Prem Chand the then Acting Secretary, Indian Institute Advance Study, Shimla, Distt. Shimla, H.P. 171005.

**(BY: MR. NEERAJ GUPTA, SR. ADVOCATE, WITH
MS. RINKI KASHMIRI, ADVOCATE)**

...

Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)
SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)

1. This petition has been filed by petitioners alleging willful violation of the order dated 22.4.2019 in M.A. No. 063/680/2019, vide which the respondents were directed to allow the petitioners to continue to work, till the next date of hearing.

2. Upon notice, respondents through Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Sr. Advocate, with Ms. Rinki Kashmiri, Advocate, put in appearance. He suffers a statement at the bar that pursuant to indicated orders of this Court, the petitioners have been allowed to work on contract basis and they are continuing as such and, therefore, C.P. may be disposed of as having been satisfied.

3. On the other hand, learned senior counsel for petitioners submitted that in view of protection granted by this Court, the services of petitioners could not be dispensed with and they have been re-engaged after break and they have not even been released salary for the integrum period by the respondents. Not only that, they have been re-employed on a less salary than what they were getting earlier. Thus, the contempt petition is still maintainable against the respondents.

4. The learned Senior Advocate for respondents submits that the salary of the petitioners, if any, due for the period they have worked would definitely be released to them, at the earliest possible.

5. Considering the overall scenario of the matter, we are of the opinion that in view of the petitioners having been re-engaged, this C.P. stands satisfied and as such it is closed. The

