



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**OA-3415/2019**

**New Delhi, this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2020**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**  
**Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

Anupam, aged 29 years, Post- Teacher  
D/o Sh. Ramesh Chand  
R/o Q. No. 1539, Type-II  
Lodhi Road Complex  
New Delhi-110003. ... Applicant

(through Sh. Yashpal Rangi)

Versus

Kendriya Vidyalaya Santathan  
Through The Commissioner  
Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (HQ)  
18, Institutional Area, Shaheed Jeet Singh Marg  
New Delhi-110016. ... Respondent

(through Sh. S. Rajappa with Sh. R. Gowrishankar)

**ORDER(ORAL)**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**

The respondent issued an Advertisement No. 12 of 2017 dated 30.09.2017, inviting applications for selection and appointment to the post of Post Graduate Teacher (PGT), Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) and Primary Teachers (PRT) in various zones. The applicant responded to the notification dated 30.09.2017, and applied for the post of TGT in



English. Reservation is provided in favour of the visually handicapped candidates and, the applicant intended to avail the same.

2. Examination, in the process of selection was conducted on 17.12.2017 and the applicant took part therein. It is stated that the applicant came to know about the declaration of results in second week of July, 2018 and when she approached the respondents, she was informed that, the selection process has already been over. The applicant approached the Commissioner for Persons with Disability, but did not get any relief. She ultimately filed this OA, with a prayer to direct the respondents to re-conduct the interview for the post of TGT (English), for visually handicapped category.

3. The applicant contends that she was not furnished the information, though she was shortlisted for the post.

4. We heard Sh. Yashpal Rangi, learned counsel for the applicant and Sh. S. Rajappa, learned counsel for the respondents.

5. The respondents have adopted the online procedure at every stage. The examination was also conducted online. The results for written test were declared on 05.02.2018 and interview was scheduled for 26.03.2018 onwards. The list comprising of the selected candidates and the shortlist is said to have been displayed in March, 2018. Selection is on the basis of the performance in the test, as well as in the interview. The applicant did not participate in the interview and was not selected.



6. The principal contention urged on behalf the applicant, is that the respondents did not give any information about her being included in the shortlist and accordingly, she was not selected.

7. Quite a large number of candidates appear in the examination and, it is almost impossible for the authorities to furnish information to individual candidates. In the Advertisement itself, it was made amply clear, that every information in this behalf, shall be online and the details of website are provided. The applicant did not find any difficulty in submitting the application through online mode and in participating in the examination, through the same mode. The applicant has to blame herself for non selection, in spite of the fact that she has been included in the shortlist. At this length of time, we cannot re-open the selection process.

8. We do not find any merit in the OA and, accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Pradeep Kumar)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**

/ns/