

5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O. A. NO. 1350/2000

New Delhi this the 19th day of January, 2001.

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ASHOK AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (A)

Kripal Singh S/O Ram Chander,
R/O A-7/1 Kondli Extension,
Behind State Bank of Patiala,
Delhi-110096.

... Applicant

(By Shri Rajeshwar Singh, Advocate)

-versus-

1. Union of India through
Secretary, Ministry of
Personnel, Public Grievances and
Pension, Deptt. of Personnel & Trg.,
Govt. of India, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Union Public Service Commission
through Secretary,
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi.

... Respondents

(By Shri N.s.Mehta, Advocate)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice Ashok Agarwal

Applicant was an aspirant for the post of Lecturer (Sculpture) in the College of Fine Arts New Delhi. He had submitted an application on 16.12.1999. He was, however, not called for interview which was held on 21.7.2000.

2. By the present application applicant has contended that candidates possessing lesser experience and qualifications had been called for interview whereas he was not called. He has mentioned names of three candidates who, according to him, possessed lesser qualifications and were called while he was not

16/1

6

so called. Candidates mentioned by him are S/Shri Pradeep Chauhan, Manoj Kumar Tanwar and Asur Ved.

3. Respondents in their counter have denied the aforesaid allegations made by the applicant. It is inter alia pointed out that respondents had adopted the mode of short-listing with the approval of the Union Public Service Commission and had provided for experience of four years in place of three years which had been advertised. Applicant did not have the experience of four years but only of three years, one month and twelve days. He was accordingly not called for the interview. As far as the aforesaid candidates are concerned, it is inter alia pointed out that only one of the three, namely, Shri Asur Ved was called for interview who had more than five years' teaching experience and had fulfilled the short-listing criteria. It is further pointed out that no candidates with names Manoj Kumar Tanwar and Pradeep Chauhan were amongst the candidates who were called for interview. However, two candidates with similar names, i.e., Shri Manoj Kumar (Roll No.78) and Shri Pradeep Kumar (Roll No.42) were called. Both these candidates had five years four months and four years eleven months teaching experience respectively and thus fulfilled the short-listing criteria.

4. Respondents have annexed a copy of the application form submitted by the applicant and the same in no uncertain terms shows that he had

7

experience of three years, one month and twelve days

Applicant in his rejoinder has sought to contend that he had in column 9 of Part-II of the application clearly mentioned that he had attached his bio data to the application form. Even in Part-II of his application he has once again reiterated his experience to be three years, one month and twelve days. As far as the bio data which he has referred to is concerned, no copy thereof has been annexed to the rejoinder. Moreover, respondents are not expected to examine the bio data especially when the application form itself which had been submitted by the applicant clearly mentioned his experience as three years, one month and twelve days.

6. In the circumstances, we have no hesitation in holding that the applicant cannot be said to have fulfilled the short-listing criteria adopted by the respondents. No grievance, therefore, can be made in his not having been called for the interview.

7. Present application, in the circumstances, we find, is devoid of merit. The same is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

SASTAL RO

(S. A. T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

Ashok Agarwal
(Ashok Agarwal)
Chairman