

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**C.P No. 495/2019 In
O.A No. 1010/2019**

This the 15th day of November, 2019

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

Narendra Kumar Jha,
Analyst 'C' in NTRO (Group 'A')
Aged 35 years
S/o. Sh. Sudhakar Jha
R/o. C/o. Mamkur Chairman
R/o. House No. 603, Ghitorni Village
New Delhi-110 030.Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Suresh Sharma)

Versus

1. Shri Satish Chandra Jha
Chairman,
NTRO, Block-III,
Old JNU Campus,
New Delhi – 110 067.

2. Shri Pradeep Kapur, IPS
Joint Secretary (Admn./Pers.)
NTRO, Block-III,
Old JNU Campus,
New Delhi – 110 067.

3. Ms. Anuradha Joshi Durgapal
Controller of Administration
NTRO, Block-III,
Old JNU Campus,
New Delhi – 110 067.

4. Ms. Latha Gopakumar,
Director (Establishment)
NTRO, Block-III,
Old JNU Campus,
New Delhi – 110 067.Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :**

This CP is filed alleging that the respondents did not comply with the orders dated 13.09.2019 passed by this Tribunal in O.A No. 1010/2019.

2. The applicant filed the O.A challenging the action of the respondents in preventing him from entering the office. Pending adjudication of the O.A, certain developments have taken place and ultimately, the applicant was permitted to discharge his duties. The O.A was disposed of taking note of the fact that the applicant is taken on duty. It was directed that the respondents shall take a decision on the charge memo issued to the applicant and to release the salary, if any due to the applicant.

3. The respondents passed an order dated 25.10.2019 observing that the manner in which the period between 30.08.2018 and 29.04.2019 must be treated and the one between 30.04.2019 and 12.09.2019 would depend upon the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings. It is also made clear that the pending salary/pay and allowances is admissible under the rules would be released subject to payment of Rs. 1.50 lakhs.

4. This C.P is filed alleging that the action taken by the respondents amounts to contempt.

5. We heard Mr. Suresh Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant.

6. In this O.A, we have taken note of the fact that the applicant is already taken on duty and observed that the respondents shall consider the feasibility of the quietus to the disciplinary proceedings. We did not issue any specific directions nor did we adjudicate upon the issues. The applicant was informed through order dated 25.10.2019 that the manner in which the different period has to be treated would depend on the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings. The final decision on this aspect is yet to be taken. In these circumstances, we do not find that any contempt was committed by the respondents.

7. The Contempt Petition is accordingly, closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/Mbt/