CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

New Delhi :this the 6th day of Decem, 1996.

HON'BLE MR.S.R.ADIGE MEMBER(A).

HON'BLE DR.A.VEDAVALLI MEMBER(J).

1). O.A.No.843/96

Vipin Kumar,
Son of Shri Niranjan Lal,
Lecturer, Jat College,
Lakhaoti,
Distt.Bulandshshar (UP).

2). O.A.No.844/96

Km.Leena Pandit,
d/o Shri Niranjan Lal Sharma,
Lecturer at Jat College,
Lakhoti,
Distt.Bulandshahr (UP).

3) O.A.No.845/96.

Km.Sarita Sharma,
D/o Shri G.P.Sharma,
R/o F-20, Patel Nagar-I,
Ghaziabad.

4) O.A.No.847/96

Hari Kishan,
R/o Village Lalgarhi,
P.O Chhaari,
Distt.Bulandshahr (UP)

5) O.A.No.848/96

Suresh Kumar,
R/o Village Lalpur,
POST-Sikandrabad,
Distt. Bulandshahr (UP)

.....Applicants.

(By Advocate: Shri O.P.Khokha)

Versus

1. Union of India through
the Secretary,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievance
and Pension (Department of Personnel &
Training),
North Block,
New Delhi.

2. Regional Director (N.R.),
Staff Selection Commission,
Block No.12, CGO Complex,
New Delhi - 110013 ....Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri E.X.Joseph).

JUDGMENT

BY HON'BLE MR.S.R.ADIGE MEMBER(A).

As all these OAs involve common question of law and fact, they are being disposed of by this common judgment. In all these OAs, the applicants are praying that those orders be quashed whereby their application for admission to the Competitive Examination for recruitment to the post of Inspector of Central Excise, Income Tax etc.,1996, was held to be not in order and incomplete.

2. On 26.4.96, counsel for the applicants as well as for the respondents were heard on the prayer for interim relief seeking a direction to the respondents to permit the applicants to appear provisionally in the said examination which was scheduled for 28.4.96. The prayer for interim relief was rejected vide our detailed order

(13)

dated 26.4.96.

3. As that date had long since passed, nothing would appear to survive in these OAs. However, during hearing Shri Khokha asserted that the Exam. Rules laying down that the date of birth as recorded in the Matriculation/ Secondary Examination Certificate or equivalent certificate would alone be accepted by the Staff Selection Commission as proof of age, operated harshly because in many instances these certificates were issued with considerable delay. He also contended that these Rules were not being enforced uniformly, and alleged that one of the applicants before us whose candidature for the above examination had been rejected in the Northern Region Examination Centre on the ground that he had not produced the Matriculation Certificate as proof of age but only the High School Mark Sheet in which his date of birth was recorded, was still able to get entry for the same examination at an examination centre in the Eastern Region.

4. Without ourselves expressing any finding on these assertions, we dispose of these OAs leaving it to the respondents to address themselves to these assertions in the light of the law, the rules and the instructions on the subject.

5. These OAs stand disposed of accordingly. No costs.

6. Let a copy of this judgment be kept on the files of each of the abovementioned OAs.

(DR.A.VEDAVALLI)
MEMBER (J).

(S.R.ADIGE)
MEMBER (A).

/ug/

Attested copy
U. Goel 11/12/96.
(USHA GOEL)
P.S. to Hon'ble Member
Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench,
New Delhi.