

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.1391 of 1996

Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J)
Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this 18th day of July, 1996

Bal Krishan Sharma
s/o Shri B.M.Sharma
r/o Qr. No.C-4, Old Police Lines
Rajpur Road
DELHI.

... Applicant

(By Shri Sama Singh, Advocate)

Versus

1. Chairman
Staff Selection Commission
C.G.O.Complex
Block No.12
Lodi Road
NEW DELHI - 110 003.

2. The Regional Director
Staff Selection Commission
C.G.O.Complex
Block No.12
Lodi Road
NEW DELHI - 110 003.

3. Deputy Director (Sh. V.P.Vohra, N.R.),
Staff Selection Commission
C.G.O.Complex, Block No.12
Lodi Road
NEW DELHI - 110 003.

... Respondents

(By Shri EX. Joseph, Senior Advocate)

O R D E R (Oral)

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

Both learned counsel heard. // As per the advertisement issued by the respondents for Recruitment of Sub-Inspectors of Delhi Police, 1996 (Annexure - B), we find that in Column-7 there is a note which reads " candidates should note that only the Date of Birth as recorded in the Matriculation/Secondary Examination Certificate or an equivalent certificate on the date of submission of the examination form will be accepted by the Commission and no subsequent request for its change will be considered or granted." The candidates were also required to attach documents with the application form, including attested copies of certificates of age, educational qualifications,

Contd...2/-

A

etc. The age limit for the applicants has been prescribed as 20-25 years as on 1.8.1996. In support of the age, the applicant has submitted in this Application that he had appended the Secondary School Certificate (Annexure-C) which clearly shows his date of birth as 22.8.1973. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that in the original application form at Column-4 the applicant has stated his date of birth as 22.8.1973 and that is sufficient to show the same.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents has submitted the original application form filed by the applicant for recruitment of Sub-Inspectors in Delhi Police, 1996 together with the enclosures for our perusal. From the original application form filed by the applicant before the respondents for the said examination, we find that only the attested copy of the statement of marks issued by the University of Delhi has been given and no certificate in support of age, as claimed by the applicant, is attached. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that it was the duty of the respondents to check whether the application is complete in all respects at the ^{time} ~~same~~ when it was given at the counter and that it was not a mandatory requirement to produce the certificate, as the applicant has already mentioned his date of birth in the application form itself.

3. We have carefully considered the above submissions. The application submitted by the applicant is not complete in terms of the advertisement for the post for which he had applied. We also find that in Note-II in Clause-23 of the advertisement it has been stated that unsigned or incomplete application

Contd....3/-

5

forms will be rejected summarily. There is no merit in this application as the applicant has failed to attach attested copy of ^{the} certificate of his age and it is, therefore, liable to be rejected.

4. In the circumstances of the case, we, therefore, find that the impugned order passed by the respondents dated 29.5.1996 is neither arbitrary, unreasonable nor illegal which justifies any interference in this matter. The Original Application is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

R.K. Ahooja
(R.K. AHOJA)
MEMBER (A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
MEMBER (J)

/RAQ/