

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.9229 of 2015

Date of Decision: May 12, 2015

Kamlesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench and
anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.BAJANTHRI.

Present: Mr.Harkesh Manuja, Advocate, for the petitioner.

-.-

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

An interlocutory order dated 16.04.2015 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench in pending contempt of court proceedings, is under challenge at the instance of the Director, Technical Education, Chandigarh Administration.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner at a considerable length, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order for more than one reasons.

Firstly, it appears to us that no writ petition is maintainable against a final or interlocutory order passed in contempt of court proceedings (please see T.Sudhakar Prasad versus Government of Andhra Pradesh, 2001 (1) SCC 516.

Secondly, the Tribunal itself has observed in the impugned order that in the Contempt Proceedings for the

time being, it has decided to entertain the objections raised by the authorities and consequently, the Tribunal has invoked its power under Rule 24 of the Rules, to determine as to what set of Rules are attracted in the facts and circumstances of the case. It is the duty of the authorities to assist the Tribunal for arriving at a just conclusion in this regard.

Dismissed.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

May 12, 2015
mohinder

[P.B.BAJANTHRI]
JUDGE