

(16) (6)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA No.628/89

NEW DELHI, this 4th day of March, 1994

Hon'ble Shri C.J. Roy, Member(J)
Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

Shri Krishan Kumar
s/o Shri Roshan Lal
Village Asaudha, Dt. Sonapat
Haryana .. Applicant

Through Shri N.S. Dalal, Advocate

Versus

Union of India, through

1. Secretary, Min. of Home Affairs
North Block, New Delhi
2. The Commissioner of Police
MSD Bldg, IP Estate
New Delhi
3. Shri Sewa Dass
Chairman, Rectt. Board,
MSU Building, IP Estate
New Delhi ... Respondents

Through Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Counsel
for the Respondents

ORDER (Oral)

By Hon'ble Shri C.J. Roy, Member(J)

This is an old case of 1989 coming up now for final hearing. Neither the applicant nor his counsel made their appearance. Ms. Rashmi Chhabra, learned proxy counsel for Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat appeared for the respondents and we have heard her.

2. The applicant is aggrieved ^{against} his non-selection for the grade of Constable in Delhi police, for which he is stated to have applied in response to a public notice issued by the respondents and appeared in physical test, written test and finally in the interview. In the OA, he has questioned the bonus marks that is given to the candidates, as provided in the Recruitment Rules for the post of Constable.

M

3. The respondents have filed their reply stating that though the applicant had qualified in the physical endurance and physical measurement test, yet he was not given any bonus mark; however he was allowed to appear in the written test held on 15.1.89 and on qualifying the same, he was called for interview but he could not make his grade in the final list prepared for successful candidates.

4. We have seen the recruitment rules for the post in question. We find that the applicant himself knew the various stages of recruitment, conditions and requisite marks to be obtained and after having subjected himself to all the test, when he is not selected in the final list of successful candidates, he can not question the validity of recruitment rules.

5. We therefore find no merit in this case. The application is therefore dismissed. No costs.

P. T. Thiruvengadam
(P.T.Thiruvengadam)
Member (A)
4.3.94

C. J. Roy
(C.J. Roy)
Member (J)
4.3.94

/tvq/