

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

(1)

O.A.NO.72/2001

Wednesday, this the 10th day of January, 2001.

Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (A)

Raj Roop Sharma,  
S/O Sh. Dhaja Ram,  
R/O H.No.884/30,  
Gali No.2, Kakroli road,  
Vikas Nagar Sonipat.  
Presently posted as  
Computer, Directorate of Census,  
Operations, Room No.207, Old Secretariat,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Delhi-54.

Applicant.

(Applicant in person)

VERSUS

1. Director,  
Directorate of Census Operations,  
Ministry of Home Affairs, GOI,  
Room No.207, Old Secretariat,  
Delhi-54.

Respondent

ORDER (ORAL)

The applicant in this OA is working as Computer in the office of the respondent in the pay scale of Rs.4000-6000/-. On 3.2.2000, the respondents issued a vacancy circular to fill up one post of Assistant in his organisation on transfer on deputation basis in the pay scale of Rs.5000-8000/-. The applicant in this OA was one of the applicants who applied for the said post of Assistant. He was interviewed by the respondents on 29.5.2000. The others, who had similarly applied, are also presumed to have been interviewed similarly. However, no details have been made available by the applicant, who submits that while another person was selected by the process of interview/DPC, he was placed at No.2 in the panel. <sup>1 same 1 1. That</sup> ~~the~~ other person, according to the applicant, did not join the post even though he was

2

(2)

allowed some extension of time for the purpose. The applicant's claim is that since that other person who was placed at No.1 in the panel did not join the post, the same should have been offered to him. He has filed a series of representations starting June, 2000 onward but so far no response has been received. It is to be noted that the applicant has not placed on record any document to show that he was actually selected by the process of interview/DPC. As a matter of fact, nothing has been placed on record to show the outcome of the exercise undertaken by the respondents in response to the vacancy circular of 3.2.2000. In the circumstances, I find that the applicant has not succeeded in disclosing any grievance relating to the aforesaid vacancy circular.

2. The applicant has brought to my notice yet another vacancy circular issued by the same respondent on 28.8.2000 whereby the applications have been invited, inter alia, for two posts of Assistant again on transfer on deputation basis. The present applicant has applied for the same and is awaiting the result. // From a paper placed on record (Annexure A-7), I find that the applicant has been placed under suspension by the respondent w.e.f. 19.10.2000. He admits that he is still under suspension. According to him, the proceedings contemplated against him are likely to have weighed with the respondents while considering his application for appointment as Assistant in response to the aforesaid circular of 3.2.2000. The same is likely to weigh with them when they undertake the exercise of empanelling Assistants in response to the vacancy



(3)

(3)

circular of 28.8.2000. It is entirely in the hands of the respondents to decide the fate of the applicant; <sup>and</sup> ~~it~~ is not possible for the Tribunal to interfere in the matter at this stage when, as stated, no grievance has been disclosed by the applicant and whatever has been disclosed would seem to be adverse to him.

3. In the aforesaid circumstances, the OA is dismissed with liberty to the applicant to approach this Tribunal if so advised after the result of empanelment based on the vacancy circular of 28.8.2000 becomes known. No costs.

*S.A.T. Rizvi*  
(S.A.T. Rizvi)  
Member (A)

/sunil/