



# **CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH**

O.A./100/1070/2020

New Delhi, this 1<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2020

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Ruby  
D/o Shri Rabeer Singh  
R/o VPO Garhi Sampla  
Rohtak, Haryana, PIN-124501 ....Applicant

(Through Shri Ajit Kakkar, Advocate)

## Versus

1. Union of India  
Through its Secretary  
Department of Personnel & Training,  
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions,  
North Block, New Delhi-110001
2. Staff Selection Commission,  
Through the Chairman,  
Block No.12, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road,  
New Delhi-110003
3. Under Secretary (C.I/I)  
SSC (HQs), Block No.12, Lodhi Road,  
Gopalpuri, CGO Complex, Lodhi Colony,  
New Delhi-110003

(Through Shri Sanjeev Yadav, Advocate)



**ORDER (Oral)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**

The applicant took part in the Combined Higher Secondary Level Examination 2019. She cleared the Tier-I examination. However, in the Tier-II examination, it was found that she did not sign the answer script in the specified place. On that account, the Staff Selection Commission cancelled her candidature. She filed an application under Right to Information (RTI) Act with a request to furnish her certain documents. Through a communication dated 28.05.2020, the respondents furnished her, the relevant page of the answer script. This OA is filed challenging the communication dated 28.05.2020.

2. The applicant contends that the omission on her part to sign at the relevant place in the answer script is very minor in nature and that the respondents ought to have given her an opportunity to rectify the same.

3. **We heard Mr.Ajit Kakkar, learned counsel for the Applicant and Mr.Sanjeev Yadan, learned counsel for the Respondents.**



4. The applicant was successful at Tier-I level. However, at Tier-II level, she did not sign on the stipulated place in page 1 of the answer script. The signature of the candidate becomes essential for the purpose of identification, particularly in these days of rampant impersonation. The applicant does not dispute that she did not sign at the relevant place. The respondents have promptly furnished her the relevant page of the answer script in reply to an application under RTI Act. It is just ununderstandable as to how such a reply can be challenged in this OA and how the applicant feels aggrieved by that.

5. We do not find any merit in the OA and the same is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(Aradhana Johri)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)**  
**Chairman**