

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

OA 364/2000

New Delhi this the 1st day of June, 2000

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Shri H.O. Gupta, Member (A)

Ms. Poornima Devi,  
D/O Shri P.N. Sonker,  
R/O H.No. 24-C J.B. G8,  
Near Swarag Ashram  
LIG Flats Mayapuri,  
New Delhi-110064.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate Kusum Sharma )

Versus

1. Govt. of National Capital Territory of  
Delhi, through Chief Secretary,  
5, Shambhavi Marg,  
Delhi-110054.

2. The Director,  
Department of Social Welfare,  
Canning Lane, Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi.

3. Smt. Poornima Vidhyarthi,  
277/13, Than Singh Nagar,  
Anand Parbat, New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Ajesh Luthra for R-1-2)  
(By Advocate P.L. Mimroth for R-3)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))

The applicant is aggrieved by the action of the respondents 1 and 2 in not considering her case for regular appointment to the post of Supervisor in the scale of Rs. 1400-2300 on the basis of the panel of selected candidates prepared after interview which was held on 17.4.1995.

2. The brief relevant facts of the case are that the applicant has been working under Respondents 1-2 since 1983 as Anganwadi Worker (A.W) and is being paid Rs. 563/-P.M. as honorarium. According to her, she has <sup>an</sup> unblemished and uninterrupted record of service. She had appeared for the interview held by the respondent 2 on 17.4.1995 for the post of Supervisor. According to her, respondents 1-2 had mixed up <sup>her case</sup> with that of respondent 3 whose name is also Ms. Poornima Vidhyarthi or there has been some deliberate attempt on the part of ~~the respondents to place~~ 18.

some official(s) working under respondents 1-2 to replace her name with that of respondent 3. The respondents have offered the post of Supervisor to respondent 3 who has since joined in that post.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, we had directed Shri Ajesh Luthra, learned counsel for respondents 1-2 to produce the relevant records dealing with the selection held by them for the post of Supervisor on 17.4.1995. Learned counsel has shown us the records. We have perused the same. We are satisfied from the records that the Staff Selection Board has considered the eligible candidates in accordance with the Rules and while giving 27 marks to respondent 3, has given only 16 marks to the applicant. We are also satisfied that the identity of the applicant and respondent 3 has not been mixed up in the records, for example, we find that the date of birth of the applicant and respondent 3 as well as the qualifications and services as A.Ws with the respondents are different. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we find no merit in this application.

4. However, considering the fact that the applicant has been working as A.W since 1983 and is being paid Rs.563/-PM as honorarium, in case she applies for any post of Supervisor with the respondents they may consider her case, in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions.

5. In the result, as we find no justification to interfere in the matter, the OA fails and it is dismissed. No order as to costs.

  
(H.O.Gupta )  
Member (A)

  
(Smt.Lakshmi Swamithan)  
Member (J)

sk