

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. NO.1764/2000

(B)

New Delhi, this the 6th day of February, 2002

Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, V.C. (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (A)

Shri Ashwani Kumar,  
S/o Shri R.N.L. Dhussa,  
House No. 10245  
Library Road,  
Azad Market  
Delhi

.... Applicant

(By Advocate : Ms. Meenu Mainee)

Versus

Union of India through:

1. The Chairman,  
Railway Recruitment Board,  
Divisional Office Compound,  
Western Railway,  
Mumbai Central,  
Mumbai

.... Respondent

(By Advocate : Ms. Anju Bhushan)

O R D E R (ORAL)

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

Heard the learned counsel on either side and the material placed on record has also been perused.

2. The applicant, who is an aspirant for the post of App. Assistant Driver (Elect./Diesel), had made an application for the post in pursuance of the notification issued by the respondents in March/April 1997. He went through the written test, the psychological test and was thereafter called for interview, but his name did not figure in the list of successful candidates published by the official respondents. 2

(2)

(A)

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the applicant's case has not been favourably considered on the ground that he did not possess ITI qualification. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, on the other hand, submits that the certificate issued to the applicant by the S.S.K. Industrial & Technical Institute, Moradabad is good enough for the purpose and should have been relied upon by the respondents. She also submits that the aforesaid certificate has been duly recognised by the U.P.S.E.B. by their Office Memorandum dated 9th December, 1977 (A-10) and also by the Directorate of Social Welfare, Govt. of U.P. (A-9). We have perused the aforesaid documents and find that the recognition given by the U.P.S.E.B. would be confined to recruitments to be made in that organisation alone and not generally when it comes to making recruitments for the Railways. The certificate issued by the Directorate of Social Welfare, we find, places reliance on the aforesaid O.M. issued by the U.P.S.E.B. The same is, therefore, not an independent certificate issued by the said Directorate. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents asserts that neither the U.P.S.E.B. nor the Directorate of Social Welfare, Govt. of U.P. are competent to certify the validity of the certificate possessed by the applicant for the purpose of employment in the Railways.

4. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel and find that the contention raised on behalf of the applicant is not well founded in terms of

(18)

the relevant rules. The certificate issued by the S.S.K. Industrial & Technical Institute, Moradabad, cannot, in our judgement, be a valid document for securing an employment for the applicant in the Railways. The present O.A. is, therefore, without any merit and deserves to be dismissed.

5. The plea of lack of territorial jurisdiction raised by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has not been pressed.

6. In view of the foregoing, the present O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.



(S.A.T. RIZVI)  
MEMBER (A)



(MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)  
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

/pkr/