

10

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA 1498/2002

New Delhi this the 1st day of January, 2003

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

1. Shri Vijay Pratap Singh
S/O Shri Sugan Chand
Village Kabir Pur Post
Office, Harsoli,
Distt. Mujaffarpur (UP)

2. Sh. Sanjay Kumar
S/O Shri Anoop Singh
R/O Village Post Rohat,
Distt. Sonapat, Haryana

..Applicants

(By Advocate Shri U. Srivastava)

VERSUS

Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi, through

1. The Chief Secretary,
Delhi Secretariat, Players
Building, Behind I.G. Stadium,
New Delhi.
2. Delhi Subordinate Service Selection
Board, through its Chairman,
Institutional Area, Vishwas Nagar,
Shahdara, Delhi-32

..Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Vijay Pandita)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)

This application has been filed by two applicants challenging the selection process done by the respondents in terms of the advertisement dated 6.5.1999 for the post of Fire Operator (FR). They have prayed for quashing of the selection proceedings with a further direction to the respondents to make further selection for the post of FO, in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions on the subject.

2. We have heard Shri U. Srivastava, learned counsel

for the applicants and perused the pleadings. We have also heard Shri Vijay Pandita, learned counsel for the respondents and seen the reply filed by the respondents. According to the respondents, no irregularities have been committed by them in the selection process and they have prepared the select list from which they would make appointments in accordance with law. Shri Vijay Pandita, learned counsel has submitted a copy of the order of the Tribunal dated 28.11.2002 in OA 173/2002, copy placed on record. He has further submitted that another application (OA493/2002) has been similarly disposed of by the Tribunal, in terms of the order dated 28.11.2002. The operative portion of this order, (para 6) reads as follows:-

" Pertaining to the abovesaid controversy, our attention was not known, from the relevant record, to any such decision taken. Admittedly, there are some vacancies. We, therefore, deem it unnecessary to probe in this regard. It is directed that respondent No.3 would take a conscious decision as to whether (a) it would like to extend the life of the panel; and (b) it would like to fill up the posts that have fallen vacant from the earlier examination/test. It would be appreciated that a speaking order is passed".

3. Shri Vijay Pandita, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the applicants in the present application are similarly situated ~~as~~ the applicants in the aforesaid two OAs, namely, OA 173/2002 and OA 493/2002.

4. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, we consider it appropriate to dispose of the present OA in terms of Para 6 of the judgement/order dated 28.11.2002 in OA 173/2002. No order as to costs.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman (J)