

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

CP No.411/2003 In  
OA No.2467/2002

New Delhi this 21<sup>st</sup> the day of July, 2004

Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Vice Chairman (A)  
Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

Mrs. Kiran  
W/o Shri Jai Prakash,  
Resident of L-2/184-A,  
DDA Flats, Kalkaji,  
New Delhi-110019.

-Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri B.B. Raval)

Versus

1. Smt. Shailaja Chandra,  
Chief Secretary,  
Government of National Capital Territory  
of Delhi, Delhi Sachivalaya,  
I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002.
2. Shri T.T. Joseph,  
Chairman, Delhi Subordinate Services  
Selection Board, UTCS Building,  
Vishwas Nagar, Shahdara, Delhi.
3. Shri Rajender Kumar,  
Director of Education,  
Delhi Sachivalaya, I.P. Estate,  
New Delhi-110002.

-Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri George Paracken)

O R D E R

Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Vice Chairman (A)

OA-2467/2002 was disposed of vide order dated  
23.6.2003 with the following directions:-

"Accordingly, we allow the application and  
quash the letter dated 18.6.2002 (Annexure  
A). It is directed that the result of the  
applicant may be declared and she should  
be considered on the merits of the matter  
as to if she has to be appointed or not.  
The decision in this regard be preferably  
taken within a period of three months from  
the date of receipt of the certified copy  
of this order. No costs".

2. On the basis of the present application, proceedings for contempt were resorted to against the respondents for non-compliance of directions of this court.

3. We have perused the original records produced by the respondents in relation to Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB), TGT (Domestic Science) Examination held on 22.8.1999. Learned counsel of the applicant maintained that applicant's case has not been considered on merit by the respondents as such she has not been appointed as TGT (Domestic Science) against a vacancy in SC category.

4. Learned counsel of the respondents stated that the DSSSB has passed a detailed speaking order on 20.2.2004 to the effect that her candidature could not be recommended for appointment in view of her merit position in the test conducted by the DSSSB. He pointed out that as per the merit list of 116 candidates of SC category who participated in the written test, applicant secured 53 marks and had been placed at S1 No. 28 of the merit list. The user department, i.e., Directorate of Education has ~~requisitioned~~ <sup>h</sup> only 11 posts of TGT (Domestic Science) belonging to SC category. While 11 SC candidates securing 59 and more marks in the test have been appointed against 11 reserved posts, applicant could not be appointed having been <sup>h</sup> placed at S1. No. 28 of the merit list. We have verified from the original

records produced by the respondents that 27 candidates were higher in merit than the applicant. Respondents have appointed 11 SC candidates as TGT (Domestic Science) against 11 reserved vacancies in accordance with their respective merit. We find that respondents have not violated directions of this court in any manner.

5. In result, this Contempt Petition is dismissed and notice to the respondent is discharged.

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju)  
Member (J)

V.K. Majotra

(V.K. Majotra)  
Vice Chairman (A)

cc.