

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No.1729/96

(2)
New Delhi this the 16th day of August 1996.

Hon'ble Mr A.V.Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Mr R.K.Ahooja, Member (A)

C.K.Haridas
S/o C.S.Kunjunn
B-11/224 Dev Nagar
New Delhi - 110 005.

(By Sh. Rajesh Nair, advocate)

...Applicant.

Versus

The Secretary
Union Public Service Commission
Shahjahan Road
New Delhi.

...Respondent.

(None)

ORDER (Oral)

Hon'ble Mr A.V.Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)

The applicant who is Assistant Editor in the Directorate of Extension, Ministry of Agriculture, is aggrieved by the fact that though he has applied in pursuance to an advertisement for appointment to the post of Joint Director (Farm Information), he has not been called for interview to be held on 20th August 1996. Finding that several others have received call letters while he did not, the applicant made a representation but it did not evince any response. Therefore, the applicant has filed this application for a direction to the respondents to call the applicant also for interview to the post of Joint Director to be held on 20th August 1996.

2. We have perused the application and heard learned counsel for the applicant. We have also seen Annexure A-1, copy of the advertisement.

The essential qualification prescribed is that the candidate must possess a Master's Degree in Agriculture of a recognised University or equivalent. The applicant does not have the prescribed degree. The applicant is a post graduate in Sociology. He does not even have a basic degree in Agriculture. A master degree in Sociology cannot ~~be~~ under any stretch of imagination be considered equivalent to be a master degree in Agriculture which is a specialised professional degree. He therefore is not qualified for the post. In the application, he has stated that the respondents have issued call letters to several others who did not fulfil the eligibility criteria. When we put a definite query to the applicant whether ~~they~~ ^{other} have or ~~does~~ not have the requisite educational qualifications, the counsel replied that they may have the qualifications but they did not have the experience. We find no merit in the application. We, therefore, reject the application under Section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act.

Replied
(R.K. Ahuja)
Member (A)

Agreed
(A.V. Haridasan)
Vice Chairman (J)

Mittal