

12  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA NO. 37/2000

New Delhi, this the 25th day of October, 2000

Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (A)

Smt. Jagmohini W/o Sh. Rajinder Kumar Sanwan,  
L-120, Gali No.15, Mahipal Pur Extension,  
Mahipalpur Village, N. Delhi-37.

.....Applicant  
(By advocate:Sh. Sudesh Kumar Sharma)

VERSUS

Government of N.C.T. through its Chairman,  
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,  
IIIrd Floor, U.T.C.S. Building, Behind Karkardooma  
Court Complex, Institutional Area, Vishwas Nagar,  
New Delhi-110032. ....Respondents

(By advocate:Sh. Vijay Pandita)

ORDER(ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh, Member (J)

The applicant in this case is aggrieved of the action of the respondents as they have not considered her candidature for the post of Sanitary Inspector in the Municipal Corporation of Delhi.

2. The facts in brief are that the applicant in response to an advertisement issued at the behest of respondents for recruitment of Assistant Sanitary Inspector in the Municipal Corporation of Delhi applied for the same. The applicant was allowed to appear in the written examination and was declared successful. Thereafter the applicant was called for interview but it is stated that at the time of interview she was asked to produce all the original documents and on verifying the documents, the respondents verbally told the applicant that her Diploma which she was holding in Public Health and Sanitation Technology was not recognised. The

K



applicant claims that her Diploma in Public Health and Hygiene is duly recognised by various State Governments and refusal to accept the same is arbitrary and illegal and she should be duly considered for appointment.

3. The respondents in their reply submitted that she was allowed to appear for interview provisionally on the basis of an undertaking given by her that she had applied for this post against the previous recruitment in 1995. However, the Selection Board did not recommend her name for selection.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the case.

5. The plea taken by the applicant that respondents had verbally told her that her Diploma is not duly recognised is of no merits because in reply the respondents have not commented upon the recognition of the Diploma rather they have stated that the applicant was duly allowed to participate in the interview but Selection Committee had not recommended her name, so on that score she was not appointed.

6. The applicant in her rejoinder has stated that since she was verbally told that her Diploma was not recognised which goes to show that the respondents have not considered the applicant on merit. To our mind this contention has no merit because once the applicant had been allowed to appear in the written examination as well

*km*

14

as in the interview and there is no written letter or order stating that the Diploma ~~.....~~ possessed by the applicant is not recognised, so it cannot be said that because of her Diploma she has not been assessed on merit.

7. On the contrary we find no reason to disbelieve the respondents, who stated that the applicant was duly considered for the post but she was not recommended for selection by the Selection Committee, as such we find that no interference is called for.

8. In view of the above, OA has no merits and the same is dismissed. No costs.

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

*Kuldeep Singh*  
(Kuldeep Singh)  
Member (J)

Rakesh