

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No.1811/96

New Delhi this the 6th day of September 1996.

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

Hon'ble Mr S.R.Adige, Member (A)

Janardan Singh
S/o Lallan Singh
R/o R-8/109 Raj Nagar
Ghaziabad (UP)

..Applicant.

(By Advocate: Sh. P.L.Mimroth)

Versus

1. Union of India through
Dept. of Personnel & Training
Ministry of Personnel, Public
Grievances & Pension
Lok Nayak Bhawan
New Delhi.
2. Sh. S.C.Kaushik
Regional Director (CR)
Staff Selection Commission (CR)
Dept. of Personnel & Training
Ministry of Personnel
Public Grievances & Pension
8 AB Beli Road, Allahabad
3. Sh.D.S.Negi
Regional Director (WR)
Staff Selection Commission (WR)
Dept. of Personnel & Training
Ministry of Personnel
Public Grievances & Pension
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay.

...Respndents.

O R D E R (Oral)


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


This application is directed against order at Annexure A-1 dated 12th July 1996 of the second respondent by which the applicant was informed that his candidature for examination for recruitment to the post of Inspectors of Central Excise/Income Tax

etc. 1995 held on 3.12.1995 has been cancelled. The applicant has stated that he has made two applications from two different stations, that the examination was first held on 3rd December 1995, that the examination was thereafter cancelled on administrative grounds, that a fresh examination was held on 11th August 1996 wherein the applicant was not allowed to participate on the basis of the impugned order dated 12th July 1996..

2. We have heard Sh. P.M.Mimroth, learned counsel for the applicant and have also gone through the application and the annexures. According to the terms of the employment notification, copy of which is annexed as Annexure A-2, a candidate is allowed to make only one application. It is very clearly mentioned that multiple applications would be rejected. It was on this basis that his candidature was cancelled by the impugned order. Moreover, after the cancellation of candidature of the applicant on 12th July 1996, the respondents held the examination and the eligible candidates participated on 11th August 1996. The applicant did not, immediately on receipt of the impugned order, approach the Tribunal or take any steps to see that he could get his candidature revived if it was permissible. Now the examination is already over, the whole exercise has become infructuous and ^{therefore} the application cannot be

further deliberated. However, the applicant has sought to have certain paragraphs in the notification set aside as unconstitutional, without making it clear in the prayer which are the paragraphs the applicant wants to have now quashed. The application, therefore, does not merit any further consideration and, therefore, we reject the same under Section 19 (3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act.


(S.R. Adige)
Member (A)


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

aa.