



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA No. 1218/2020

New Delhi, this the 04th day of September, 2020

(through video conferencing)

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

Bharat Singh Rathore S/o Shri Abhay Singh
Rathore,
R/o 13, Murlidhar Vyas Colony,
Behind Bhootnath Temple,
Bikaner, Rajasthan – 334001.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Siddharth K. Dwivedi)

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Department of Personnel and Training,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and
Pension, North Block, New Delhi.

2. Staff Selection Commission (Hdqrs.),
Through its Secretary cum Controller of
Examinations, Block No. 12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road, Near Jawahar Lal Nehru Stadium,
New Delhi – 110003.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Anil Kumar Singh)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:-



The Staff Selection Commission (SSC), the 2nd respondent herein, issued notification in the year 2018 for the post of Stenographer 'C' & 'D'. The examination was conducted on 28.11.2018. The applicant took part in the same. In the result, it emerged that the applicant was not successful. He sought some information under Right to Information Act, 2005. The same was accordingly replied. Thereafter, he approached the Department of Personnel & Training (DoP&T) seeking certain clarifications and that was also answered. The applicant contends that there was a serious doubt about the accuracy of evaluation of the transcripts and to satisfy himself, he wanted copy of the transcript, to be furnished to him. He has also stated that that the 2nd respondent itself has undertaken review of the evaluation in the year 2018, and there is absolutely no basis for not extending similar facility at this stage to the applicant.

2. We heard Mr. Siddharth K. Dwivedi, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. A K Singh, learned counsel for respondents, at the stage of admission, through video conferencing.

3. The applicant was one of the candidates for the examination for selection to the post of Stenographer 'C' & 'D' in the year 2018. From the record, it is evident that



the entire evaluation, including that of the transcript was done through the computers. When the applicant sought information, he was furnished the same.

4. The applicant, in effect, wants revaluation of the answer script, which is in the form of transcript. It is fairly well settled that the revaluation of answer script at any examination can take place only when there exists a provision for that purpose. In the absence of such provision, undertaking the revaluation would lead to several complications, if not arbitrariness.

5. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union Public Service Commission etc. v. Angesh Kumar & others** (Civil Appeal No.6159-6162/2013) decided on 20.02.2018, held that revaluation cannot be undertaken in competitive examinations, unless there is a clear provision.

6. We do not find any merit in the O.A., and the same is dismissed accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/sunil/jyoti/ankit/dsn