

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

O.A.No.1680/2019

Dated Wednesday, the 18th day of December, 2019

PRESENT

Hon'ble Mr.P.Madhavan, Judicial Member

&

Hon'ble Mr.T.Jacob, Administrative Member

V. Vijayaragavan

No. 712/A, Minnagar

6th Street, Vengikkal

Tiruvannamalai – 606 604.

....Applicant

By Advocate M/s. R. Malaichamy

Vs

Union of India

Rep. By the Director

Board of Apprenticeship Training

(Southern Region)

Ministry of Human Resource Development

Government of India

Department of Higher Education

C.I.T. Campus

Taramani, Chennai – 600 113.

....Respondent

By Advocate Mr.Su.Srinivasan

(Order: Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr.P.Madhavan, Member(J))

Heard. The applicant has filed this OA under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

- "i. To direct the respondent to permit the applicant to attend the Graduate Apprenticeship program and
- ii. To pass such further orders"

2. When the matter came up for consideration, learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant being a Bachelor of Engineering applied for Graduate Apprenticeship against notification issued by the respondents. The applicant was called for certificate verification and his name was found at Serial No. 97 of the shortlisted candidates list. Thereafter the respondents published selection list dt. 29.11.2019 that as per MHRD instruction and availability of inadequate grants to meet 50% reimbursement, the training slots have been scaled down and therefore the total Graduate Apprentice (Category I) apprenticeship training of 218 was reduced to 58 and after reduction of slots, the applicant name has been placed in the waiting list at Serial no. 6. Whereas the learned counsel for the applicant submits that 50% comes around 109 and not 58 for Graduate Apprenticeship. Hence he submits that calling candidates in the ratio of 1:20 is not acceptable.

Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant will be satisfied if he is permitted to give a fresh representation to the respondents regarding his grievance and the competent authority is directed to dispose of the said representation within a time frame.

3. Mr.Su.Srinivasan takes notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the respondents have no objection for disposal of the representation of the applicant on merits.

4. In view of the limited submission and without going into the merits of the case, the OA is disposed of in the following lines:

“The applicant is permitted to make a fresh representation to the respondents immediately within two weeks from the date of order and the competent authority is directed to consider and dispose of the said representation by passing a speaking order as per the relevant rules and regulations, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of such representation.”

**(T.JACOB)
MEMBER (A)**

18.12.2019

**(P.MADHAVAN)
MEMBER (J)**

M.T.