



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**MA No. 2283/2020
and
OA No. 1805/2020**

Today, this the 11th day of November, 2020

Through video conferencing

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Manisha Tanu,
Aged about,
W/o Sh. Piush Kumar,
R/o 804, Magadh Indraprasth Apartment,
Indraprastha Colony,
Sector – 30-33, Faridabad,
Post : Assistant Teacher,
Employee ID: 20036356
Group – B.

.. Applicant

(Through Mr. Anuj Aggarwal with Mr. T. T. Lepcha, Advocate)

Versus

1. The Director of Education,
Directorate of Education,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Old Secretariat Building,
Civil Lines, Delhi – 110054.
2. Rani Jhansi Sarvodaya Kanya Vidyalaya,
Through its HoS,
Railway Colony,
Tuglakabad, Delhi – 110044.

.. Respondents

(Through Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Advocate)

Order (Oral)



Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

MA No. 2283/2020

This application is filed with a prayer to condone the delay of 306 days in filing the OA. The applicant intends to challenge an order dated 28.12.2018, through which the respondents promoted several Assistant Teachers (Primary) to the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT). She contends that at that time, her mother was diagnosed with Cancer and that was followed by the present Covid-19 situation.

2. We heard Mr. Anuj Aggarwal with Mr. T.T. Lepcha, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. We are convinced that the delay is properly explained. Therefore, the MA is allowed and the delay is condoned.

OA No. 1805/2020

4. The applicant is working as Assistant Teacher (Primary) in the Directorate of Education (GNCTD). The promotion from that post, is to the post of TGT. An order dated 28.12.2018 was passed by the respondents, promoting as many as 525 Assistant Teachers (Primary) to the post of TGT on ad hoc basis. That was on the basis of the recommendations of the Departmental Screening Committee. The applicant contends that though she



was senior enough, her case was not considered whereas several juniors to her were considered. She made a representation on 10.01.2019 ventilating her grievances, which is said to have not been responded to by the respondents. The promotion order is challenged in the OA in so far as she was denied promotion to the post of TGT.

5. We heard Mr. Anuj Aggarwal with Mr. T. T. Lepcha, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel for the respondents.

6. The promotion seems to be ad hoc but on the basis of recommendations of the Departmental Screening Committee. The question is as to whether she was considered at all for promotion and, if so, the circumstances that led to denial of promotion need to be communicated to her. The representation made by the applicant cannot be kept pending indefinitely.

7. We, therefore, dispose of the OA by directing the respondents to pass an order on the representation dated 10.01.2019 submitted by the applicant within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

/jyoti/vb/ankit/sd/akshaya7dec/