



**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**O.A. No. 539/2020  
with  
M.A. No. 697/2020**

**This the 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2020**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

1. Karampal, Age-31 years,  
Designation-Warder (Male), Group-C  
Village-Dhulliera Khurd  
Post-Jhabuwa, Tehsil-Bawal  
District-Rewari, Haryana

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Sh. Shakti Narayan)

**VERSUS**

1. The Chairman  
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,  
FC-18, Institutional Area, Karkardooma  
Delhi-110092
2. Director General of Prisons,  
Prisons Headquarters,  
Near Lajwanti Garden Chowk,  
Tihar, New Delhi-110064

...Respondents

**ORDER (Oral)**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J):**

The present original application has been filed by the applicant u/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985, alleging that the respondents have not



issued cut-off marks of PET-V for Post Code-37/13 for the post of Warder (Male) against the SC Category.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the respondents vide their Advertisement No. 2/13 advertised the posts to be filled up against the Post Code-37/13 in Delhi Prison Department. The applicant being eligible for the said post under the respondents, applied in response to the said Advertisement.

3. He further submits that the respondents have issued the cut-off marks for PET-I, PET-II, PET-III and PET-IV for filling up the vacant posts, however, in spite of the fact that sufficient number of vacancies remained unfilled, respondents have not issued the cut-off marks for PET-V. The learned counsel for the applicant further submits that had the respondents issued the cut-off marks for PET-V, the applicant could also have been considered.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant argued that being aggrieved of the aforesaid, the applicant has preferred a detailed representation dated 25.12.2019 (Annexure-A8), however, the same has not been considered and disposed of by the respondents.



5. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and have perused the documents on record carefully.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant has not been able to show any Rule or instructions which requires the respondents to issue the cut-off marks for PET-V as well. He has also not been able to show that the applicant was shortlisted by the respondents, however, the applicant has not been considered for the aforesaid post.

7. So far as the representation of the applicant is concerned, the applicant has admittedly preferred the representation only on 25.12.2019 and he has filed the present OA on 31.01.2020. Admittedly, the applicant has approached this Tribunal without waiting for a period of six months as required u/s 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985. No extraordinary circumstance has been brought to our notice requiring us to deal with the merit before the lapse of six months as required ordinarily as per the provision of Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.



8. In view of the aforesaid, we find that the present OA is pre-mature and accordingly the same is dismissed as pre-mature. Pending MA also stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member (A)**

**(R.N. Singh)**  
**Member (J)**

/akshaya/