

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

O.A.NO.145/98

(16)

New Delhi, this the 22nd day of August, 2000

HON'BLE MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (A)

ASI Gulab Singh, S/O Late Sh. Murli
Singh, R/O C/6, Old Police Lines, Delhi.Applicant
(By Advocate: Ms. Sumedha Sharma)

Versus

1. Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi.
2. Commissioner of Police, Police Headquarters, I.T.O., M.S.O. Building, I.P.Estate, New Delhi.
3. Dy. Commissioner of Police, Police Headquarters (I), I.P.Estate, M.S.O. Building, New Delhi.

....Respondents

(By Advocate: Sh. Ajay Gupta)

ORDER (Oral)

Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

The applicant is aggrieved by the order passed by the respondents dated 25.11.97 (Annexure-E) in which after holding a review DPC for eligible candidates, the applicant's name was not included in the list.

2. We have perused the pleadings and have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
3. One of the main grounds taken by Ms. Sumedha Sharma, learned counsel was that the review DPC has not been conducted in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions. Learned counsel has submitted that according to the applicant's assessment of the relevant five years' ACRs, i.e., from 1991 to 1996, he ought to

(2) RA

have been graded as "Good" if not better and the DPC had wrongly assessed him as "Average". In order to satisfy ourselves, we had asked the respondents to produce the relevant records, including the ACRs of the applicant for the relevant period. This has been done by Sh. Ajay Gupta, learned counsel. We have perused the relevant ACRs of the applicant for the years 1991 to 1996 which was admittedly ^{the} relevant ~~and~~ ^{for} which was to be considered by the review DPC, on the basis of which the aforesaid order dated 25.11.97 has been issued. These records have also been shown to Ms. Sumedha Sharma, learned counsel.

4. From a perusal of the relevant records produced by the respondents, we are satisfied that the review DPC in question has assessed the work of the applicant correctly with regard to the grading he has obtained and in any case, we find no merit in this application or any justification to interfere in the matter.

5. In the circumstances, for the reasons given above, the OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

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

/sunil/

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)