

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

CP No.68 of 2015  
IN  
OA No.3580 of 2014

This the 16<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2015

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL, MEMBER (J)**  
**HON'BLE MR. SHEKHAR AGARWAL, MEMBER (A)**

1. Joginder Singh, aged - 46 years  
S/o Shri Om Prakash  
Working as S.E.A. at HPT, AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o H.No.627, Sector-15, Sonapat,  
(Haryana).
2. Ashok Kumar, Aged - 52 years  
S/o Sh. Hari Ram Sharma,  
Working as SEA at HPT, AIR Khampur,  
Delhi-36.  
R/o E-31, Prashant Vihar, Delhi-85.
3. Ravinder Kumar Taluja, Aged 53 ½ years  
S/o Sh. Nand Lal Taluja,  
Working as A.E. at HPT AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36,  
R/o H.No.229, Sector-I, Rohtak (Haryana).
4. Baljit Singh Singhal, Aged 53 ½ years  
S/o Sh. Ram Kishan,  
Working as SEA at HPT AIR, Khampur,  
Delhi-36  
R/o H.No.205, Hiranano Colony Garh,  
Sahazanpur, Sonepet (Haryana).
5. Anup Singh Shokeen, Aged - 47 Years,  
S/o Sh. Jagat Singh,  
Working as A.E. at HPT, AIR Khampur,  
Delhi-36  
R/o JD-58D, Pitampur, Delhi.
6. Ummed Singh Bhandari, Aged - 45 years,  
s/o Sh. Puran Singh,  
working as A.E. at HPT, AIR, Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o D-3/12, Radio Colony, Kingsway Camp,  
Delhi-09.
7. Rajesh Kumar Jangir, Aged - 47 years,  
S/o Sh. Hemraj Jangir,  
Working as S.E.A. at H.P.T. AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36.  
R/o B-7-188, Sector-5, Rohini,  
New Delhi-85.

8. Ram Niwas Dhiran, Aged - 53 years  
S/o Sh. Raghubeer Singh,  
Working at HPT, AIR Khampur,  
Delhi-36  
R/o A-2/36, FF, Sec.-15,  
Rohini, Delhi-110089.
9. Jitender Kumar Goel, Aged - 59 ½ years  
S/o Sh. Mishari Lal,  
Working as SEA at HPT, AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o H.No.1722, Sector-05, U.E.,  
Kurukshetra (Haryana).
10. Mukesh Richhariya, Aged - 47 years,  
S/o Sh. D.P. Richhariya,  
Working as S.E.A. at H.P.T. AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36.  
R/o EO-34A, Pitampura, Delhi-34.
11. Dharam Singh, Aged - 51 Years,  
S/o Sh. Chhaju Ram,  
Workng at HPT AIR, Khampur,  
Delhi- 36  
R/o Vill Chander Bhan Pura,  
P.O. Amin Distt. Kurukshetra (Haryana)
12. Surender Pal, Aged - 50 years,  
S/o Sh. Ramji Dass,  
Working as SEA at HPT, AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o H.No.556 L. Model Town, Karnal (Haryana).
13. Ashwani Kumar, aged - 52 years,  
s/o Sh. Mangal Sain,  
Working at HPT, AIR, Khampur,  
Delhi-36  
R/o Flat No.55, Pocket H-5, Sector-16,  
Rohini, Delhi-89.
14. Vinod Kumar, Aged - 48 years,  
S/o Sh. Satya Pal Bhardwaj,  
Working as S.E.A. at AIR Rohtak,  
R/o D-5, Radio Colony Subhash Road,  
Rohtak.
15. Balwan Singh aged - 52 years,  
s/o Sh. Govind Singh,  
working as S.E.A. at HPT AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o Govind Bhawan, Vill. Sultanpur Dabas Delhi-39.

16. Rajendra Kumar, Aged - 44 years  
S/o Sh. Chaman Lal,  
Working as EA at HPT, AIR,  
Khampur, Delhi-36  
R/o H.No.1569, Sector-8,  
Kurukshetra.

...Applicants

(By Advocate : Ms. Jyoti Singh, Senior Counsel with  
Shri Yogesh Sharma)

versus

1. Sh. Bimal Julka,  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,  
Govt. of India, Shastri Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Ms. Vijaya Laxmi Chabra,  
Director General Doordarshan,  
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg,  
New Delhi.
3. Sh. Faiz Sayhad,  
Director General,  
All India Radio,  
Akashwani Bhawan, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Advocates : Shri S.M. Arif with Shri Vikrant Yadav for R-2 and R-3 and Shri Sameer Aggarwal for R-1)

### **ORDER (ORAL)**

#### **MR. JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL, MEMBER (J) :**

We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

2. In compliance with the Order passed by the Tribunal, the respondents have rejected the claim of the applicants by passing a speaking and reasoned order dated 13.10.2015.

3. Learned senior counsel for the applicants pointed out that the applicants are similarly situated as the applicant in OA No.514/2002 but the claim of the applicants has been wrongly rejected. It was pointed out that option was given to the applicant of OA No.514/2002 to opt out of higher scale

granted vide order dated 25.2.1999 and similar option should have been extended to the applicants, but has not been extended. Therefore, the applicants despite being similarly situated as the applicant in OA No.514/2002 have been denied the same benefit.

4. The aforesaid contention does not fall within the realm of contempt jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The applicants may have appropriate remedy against the order dated 13.10.2015 in accordance with law, if they are aggrieved by the same. However, it cannot be said that by passing the said speaking Order dated 13.10.2015, the respondents have committed any wilful disobedience of the Order of this Tribunal so as to make them liable for Contempt of Court. In the Order of the Tribunal itself, it has been stated that if the respondents do not find the applicants to be similarly situated, in that case, the applicants shall have liberty to challenge the order so passed in appropriate original proceeding. It is thus, manifest that after passing of speaking order dated 13.10.2015 by the respondents, nothing survives for determination in the contempt jurisdiction.

5. Resultantly, the instant Contempt Petition is disposed as infructuous. Notices issued to the respondents stand discharged.

6. MAs are also disposed of as have been rendered infructuous.

**(SHEKHAR AGARWAL)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

/ravi/