



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

O.A. No. 485/2021

This the 02nd day of March, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Gautam Kumar, Aged – 26 years, Group – B
RMK4-515, Shiv Mandir,
Post Sindri, Rangamati, and Dhanbad – 828122

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Ms. Amrita Mishra)

Versus

1. Union of India
Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas and Steel
Through its Secretary
2. Steel Authority of India Limited,
Ispat Bhawan, Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003
Through its Chief Managing Director

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Alakh Kumar for Respondent No. 1;
Shri S.M. Zulfiqar Alam for Respondent No. 2)

ORDER (Oral)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:

The respondents issued an advertisement in May, 2019, inviting applications for selection of candidates for the post of Management Trainees in various disciplines. A sum of Rs.700/- is also stipulated as fee for the application. It is



stated that the applicant uploaded the application in all respects but did not pay the fees.

2. On account of increase in the number of vacancies, the respondents issued another advertisement in November 2019, in continuation of the earlier one. A clause was added to the effect that the candidates who applied in response to the earlier notification need not apply. The applicant contends that when he made an effort to upload his application in response to the 2nd advertisement, but it did not materialize, notwithstanding the fact that the fee was also paid. The respondents published a list of eligible candidates for consideration on 13.03.2020. The name of the applicant did not find place in that.

3. This OA is filed with a prayer to direct the respondents to consider the case of the applicant for selection to the post, referred to above. He contends that for no fault of him, he is excluded from the list of eligible candidates.

4. We heard Mrs. Amrita Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Alakh Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents at the stage of admission.

5. The record discloses that though the applicant made an effort to upload the form in May, 2019, it was incomplete on account of the fact that he did not pay the fee which is stipulated as Rs. 700/-. Another advertisement ensued



six months later, and this time, he paid the fees but the application remained incomplete. It appears to be on account of the fact that the identity which is fed into the system at the first instance, would continue to be reflected in the 2nd instance also.

6. Be that as it may, once the applicant has uploaded his application and paid the fees also, the small technical snag which came in the way of generating the receipt cannot be permitted to defeat his candidature. We are of the view that the applicant can be given an opportunity to take part in the selection process.

7. We, therefore, allow the OA and direct the respondents to include the name of the applicant in the list of eligible candidates. The 2nd respondent shall take necessary steps as and when the applicant approaches him. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/vinita/pj/ns/ankit/akshaya/

