

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

**C.P. No. 424/2016 in
O.A. No. 1575/2015**

New Delhi, This the 9th day of December, 2016

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. SULLAR, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. P.K. BASU, MEMBER (A)

1. Association of Radio & Television,
Engineering Employees, through its'
President Sh. Umesh Chandra Room No. 542,
Akashwani Bhawan,
New Delhi-I
2. Sanjiv Singh, Aged 38 years,
S/o. Sh. Vakeel P. Singh,
Technician, TV Relay Centre,
JAMUI, Pin-811307 (Bihar),
R/o vil. Mijaki, Police Station Had,
Karagpur, Distt. Mungair, Bihar. ... Petitioners

(By Advocate: Mr. Yogesh Sharma)

Versus

1. Sh. Ajay Jindal,
Secretary,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Govt. of India, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001
2. Sh. Jawahar Sircar,
Chief Executive Officer,
Prasar Bharati, PTI Building,
New Delhi-110001.
3. Madam Superya Sahu,
Director General,
Doordarshan, Mandi House,
Copernicus Marg, New Delhi-110001.
4. Sh. F. Sheharyar,
Director General,
All India Radio,
Akashwani Bhawan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi -110001. ... Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. D.S. Mahendru, Ms. Priyanka Raj for Mr.
Rajeev Sharma for R-2)

ORDER (ORAL)**Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)**

As is evident from the record the Original Application (O.A.) preferred by the petitioners, Association of Radio and Television Engineering Employees and Ors. was disposed of vide order dated 01.06.2016 by this Tribunal. The order reads as under :-

“Both sides agreed that in view of the decisions in Utpal Karfa & Ors in OA No. 350/01530/2014 (for Technician) of CAT, Kolkatta Bench and in Mahendra Singh Rana in O.A. No. 1743/2004 (Engineering Assistants) of CAT, Principal Bench of this Tribunal, the matters have been referred by the respondent No.1 to the Ministry of Finance for their opinion to implement the order passed in the aforementioned O.As, which is pending before the Ministry of Finance.

2. In view of this, the O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage itself with a direction to the respondents to expedite the issue and pass a final order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In case, the applicants are still aggrieved of that order, they are at liberty to challenge the same by filing a fresh O.A., in accordance with law. No costs.

3. Accordingly, the MA also stands disposed of.”

2. According to the petitioners, the respondents have not complied with the order of this Tribunal, which necessitated them to file the instant Contempt Petition (C.P).

3. In the wake of notice, learned counsel appeared and sought time to file compliance report on behalf of all the respondents. Now, learned counsel for respondents has placed on record the compliance report, by way of an affidavit, wherein it was stated that the respondents have already complied with the directions contained in the order of this Tribunal by virtue of order dated 27.01.2016 (Annexure CP/R-2). A copy of the same has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for petitioners has fairly acknowledged that respondent no. 1 has complied with the direction of this Tribunal, by passing the order dated 27.01.2016 but, his apprehension is that respondents would not release the amount in pursuance thereof, within the reasonable period.

5. Thus, it would be seen that as the respondents have substantially complied with the indicated order of this Tribunal, so, no further action is required to be taken in the matter.

6. Therefore, the C.P. is hereby dismissed and the Rule of Contempt is accordingly, discharged.

7. At the same time, respondents no. 2 to 4 are directed to release the amount of arrears, in pursuance thereof, to the petitioners, within a period of two months, from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Order **Dasti.**

(P. K. Basu)
Member (A)

(Justice M. S. Sullar)
Member (J)
09.12.2016

/Mbt/