



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

OA No. 524/2020

New Delhi, this the 24th day of February, 2020

**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE VIJAY LAKSHMI, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. PRADEEP KUMAR, MEMBER (A)**

Ms. Rachna,
Aged 37 Years,
D/o Sh. Vir Singh
R/O L1/61A DDA Flats
Kalkaji, Delhi- 110006

... Applicant

(through Sh. Divyank Rana & Sh. Abhishek)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Through Chief Secretary
Naya Sachivalaya, I.P. Estate
New Delhi 110002
2. Director of Education
Directorate of Education
Old Secretariat Delhi 110054
3. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB)
The Govt. of NCTE of Delhi
FC-18, Institutional Area, Karkardooma,
Delhi-110092
Through its Secretary

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. H. A. Khan)

ORDER (O R A L)**BY HON'BLE MR. PRADEEP KUMAR, MEMBER (A):**

The applicant, Ms. Rachna is aggrieved with the vacancy notification advertised by DSSSB by Advt. No. 04/20 for the post of PGT (Physical Education-Female) against Post Code 80/20. Maximum age limit prescribed for this post as per this advertisement is “not exceeding 30 years, Age relaxation will be given as per the table at para 6”. Certain age relaxation is also specified for contractual employees/teachers and those who were teaching in a university. This is also specified that “this post is not identified suitable for PwD candidate as per requisition of user department”.

The applicant is above age relaxation specified as the applicant is already 37 years of age. However, she wants to apply against this advertisement. She is seeking a direction through this OA to modify the age criteria.

2. The applicant relies upon a judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP (C) No. 1035/2014 delivered on 22.08.2014 (**Asha Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Ors.**) wherein certain age relaxation were granted for the post of 'Librarian'. The applicant pleads that this is at par for the post of teacher and accordingly, she is entitled for the age relaxation.



She further pleads that she is serving Kendriya Vidyalaya for ten years, whereas this experience is not to be counted as per the advertisement.

3. Matter has been heard at admission stage. Learned counsel Sh. Divyank Rana represents the applicant and learned counsel Sh. H. A. Khan represents the respondents on advance information.

4. The respondents have specified certain maximum age for the post of Physical Education Teacher, which is different from other category of teachers in the same advertisement. For some of those other posts, the maximum age prescribed is 36 years.

It is well within the competence of respondents to specify the eligibility criteria. The Tribunal does not find the criteria unreasonable.

5. The Tribunal does not find merit in the contentions and grievance of the applicant. The relied upon judgement is also of no help to the applicant as that is for Librarian whereas the present case is that of PGT Physical Education. Accordingly, the instant OA is dismissed at admission stage itself being devoid of merits. No order as to costs.

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)

(Justice Vijay Lakshmi)
Member (J)

