

Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench

Original Application No. 2206 of 2002

New Delhi, this the 26th day of May, 2003

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Dr. V.T. Prabhakaran,  
S/o late Shri T. Sankara Menon  
Working as Principal Scientist &  
Acting Head (Biometrics)  
Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute,  
New Delhi-12  
.... Applicant

(Appeared in person)

Versus

1. The Union of India  
Through the Secretary,  
Department of Agricultural  
Research & Education,  
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-1
2. The Chairman  
Agricultural Scientists' Recruitment Board,  
Krishi Anusandhan Bhawan-I,  
Pusa, New Delhi-12
3. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research,  
Through its Secretary,  
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-1  
.... Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri V.K. Rao with Shri Karunesh Tandon)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman

The applicant is working as Principal Scientist and Acting Head of the Division of Biometrics at Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute (IASRI). He is one of the candidates for the post of Joint Director IASRI. An advertisement had appeared. The applicant is aggrieved by the constitution of the Selection Committee and contends that the rules have been violated. According to him, the Director was biased against him and two other Members were closely associated with another candidate V.K. Gupta.

2. By virtue of the present application, the



applicant seeks to declare that the constitution of the Interview Board is improper and quash the same.

3. Needless to state that the application as such has been contested. Respondents contend that the application is premature because the result of the selection as yet has not been declared. It is not known as to which of the candidate has since been selected. On merits also, the assertions of the applicant are being controverted.

4. We have heard the applicant who has appeared in person as well as the respondents' learned counsel.

5. The preliminary objection raised by the respondents, which is not in dispute, is that the selection committee had met but the result of the selection as yet has not been declared. Even during the pendency of the present application, the order passed was that appointment, if any, shall be subject to the final outcome of the present application but still respondent no.1 had deemed it appropriate not to declare the result.

6. Once the result has not been declared and it is not known as to who is the successful candidate, it would be improper for this Tribunal to go into the other controversies which were put forward by the applicant. It is not only that the application is premature because the result has not been declared but there are other cogent reasons to come to the same conclusion. After the

*U Ag*

11

selection process is over, there would be a candidate selected. It could be the applicant. In case there is <sup>2</sup> ~~is~~ third person, any order passed by this Tribunal would affect his valuable rights. In the circumstances, we only reiterate what has been stated above that it is only ~~at~~ <sup>the</sup> initial stage and it would be improper to go into the other controversies raised by the applicant.

7. Resultantly we dismiss the present application being premature but hasten to add that we are not expressing ourselves on the merits of the contentions raised by the applicant.

( Govindan S. Tampi )  
Member (A)

( V.S. Aggarwal )  
Chairman

/dkm/