

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No. 1948 of 1994

8

New Delhi, dated this the 27th July, 1999

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE MR. P.C. KANNAN, MEMBER (J)

S/Shri

1. Ajaib Singh,
S/o Shri Shankar Singh,
R/o X-137/1, Gali No. 11,
Brahmpuri, Delhi.

2. Satya Pal Singh,
S/o Shri Dharambir Singh,
R/o Quarter No. B-10,
P.S. Bhajanpura,
Delhi.

... Applicants

(None appeared)

Versus

1. Commissioner of Police, Delhi
Delhi Police Headquarters,
M.S.O. Building,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi.

2. Addl. Commissioner of Police (Admn.),
Delhi Police Headquarters, M.S.O. Building,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi.

3. Dy. Commissioner of Police (HQ),
Delhi Police Headquarters,
M.S.O. Building, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Bhaskar Bhardwaj proxy
counsel for Ms. Jyotsna Kaushik)

ORDER (Oral)

BY HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

Applicants impugn Respondents' order dated
21.1.94 vide which the names of applicants have not been
brought on promotion list 'E' (Ministerial)
as also Respondents' letters dated 9.3.94 and 30.3.94
rejecting their representations.

7

9

2. None appeared for applicant when the case was called out even on the 2nd call. Shri Bhaskar Bhargava appeared as proxy counsel for Ms. Jyotsna Kaushik for respondents and has been heard.

3. The materials on record reveal that applicants were confirmed as ASI w.e.f. 11.11.87. Their names were considered by a regularly constituted DPC for promotion list 'E' (Ministerial) along with their counter-parts on 18.1.94, but they were found unfit for inclusion in the aforesaid list.

4. It is not denied that the admission to Promotion List 'E' is on the basis of selection tempered by seniority, and efficiency and honesty are the main factors governing the selection.

5. Respondents have invited our attention to the guidelines for the DPC laid down by the DP&T which allows DPCs to enjoy full discretion to devise appropriate methods and procedures for objective assessment of the suitability of candidates. It has been pointed out that the DPC did consider the cases of applicants along with others and the DPC chose ^{to not select} ~~to ignore~~ those whose overall rating was assessed as 'average or below' and as the applicants fell in this category they were not selected for admission to List 'E' (Ministerial).

6. These assertions have not been denied in any rejoinder filed by applicants and none has appeared on behalf of them to challenge the same during hearing.

10

7. Under the circumstances we find there are no good grounds to warrant our judicial interference in the O.A. which is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

D. Kannan
(P.C. KANNAN)
MEMBER (J)

S. R. Adige
(S.R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

/OK/