

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi****OA No.177/2021
MA No.205/2021****WITH****OA No.122/2021
MA No.140/2021**Today, this the 28th day of January, 2021Through video conferencing**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)****OA No.177/2021**

1. Ajay Sheoran
S/o Mr. Rohtash Kumar
Age 31 years
R/o House No.124, HTM Colony
Azad Nagar, Hisar
Hisar, Haryana-125001.
2. Kuldeep Singh
S/o Mr. Munshi Pali
Age 28 years
Address-38, Krishna Colony
Near Bhadoria Marriage Home
Kala Kua, Alwar
Rajasthan-301001.

...Applicants

(By Advocate: Mr. Rajshekhar Rao and Mr. Ashutosh
Ghade)

Vs.



1. Union of India
through Secretary
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel and Training
North Block, New Delhi-110001. DELHI.
2. Staff Selection Commission
Through Chairman
Block No.12, 5th Floor
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi, Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. K.M. Singh)

OA No.122/2021

1. Ritu Garg
DOB:21/11/1990
Father's name: Sudhir Kumar Garg
Address: 1277 Gaur Cascades
Raj Nagar Extension, Ghaziabad
U.P.-201017
2. Vinod Vedwal
DOB-4/10/1985
Father name-Ani Lal Vedwal
Address – WZ – 97, Street No.-3A
Sadh Nagar Part-1
Palam Colony
New Delhi-110045.
3. Gopinath N.
DOB – 11/12/1987
Fathers Name – Nanthagopal
Address-Sree Krishna Bhavan
Krishna Purathu Lane

Near K.S.R.T.C. Stand
Perumbavoor, Ernakulam
Kerala-683542



4. Gaurav Kumar
DOB – 30.08.1990
Father's Name-Mukesh Kumar
Add.-C-14, NSG Society
Greater Noida
Uttar Pradesh-201013
5. Puneet Khatri
DOB – 24/08/1990
Father's name – Duli Chand Khatri
Address-K-187, Devi Road
Kamla Nehru Nagar
Jodhpur, Rajasthan
6. Pradeep Kumar
DOB – 27-11-1987
Father's Name-Late Om Prakash Yadav
Address-Gali No.-Qtr No.01, Type 3
Customs Colony, Kanwar-581301.
7. Susheel
DOB – 18 AUG 1990
Father's Name- Balraj Singh
Address-H No.769/21
Kailash Colony
Rohtak, Haryana-124001
8. Deepak Chonkar
DOB-25 Dec 1985
Fathers Name – Jagdish Rai Chonkar
House No.2089, Sector-2

HUDA, Rohtak
Haryana-124001.



9. Jitender Kumar Sharma
DOB-08 Oct 1990
Father's name – Shanti Parshad Sharma
Address – H.No.824, Street No.16
Hari Vishnu Colony
Sirsa, Haryana-125055
10. Siddharth Singh
DOB-26 Nov 1990
Father's Name – Som Pal Singh
A-1/59, Chankaya Palce
PART-1, Pankha Road
New Delhi-110059.

...Applicants

(By Advocates: Mr. Rajshekhar Rao and Mr. Ashutosh Ghade)

Vs.

1. Union of India
through Secretary
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel and Training
North Block, New Delhi-110001. DELHI.
2. Staff Selection Commission
Through Chairman
Block No.12, 5th Floor
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi, Delhi.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Ms. Anushree Kapadia for Shri
Rajpal Singh)



ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:

By this common order, we propose to dispose of OA No.177/2021 and OA No.122/2021, as common question of facts and law are involved.

2. The Staff Selection Commission issued Notice dated 29.12.2020 proposing to conduct Combined Graduate Level Examination 2020 (CGLE). The age limit stipulated is 18 years as minimum and 27 years maximum, with certain relaxations, in favour of certain categories. The date of reckoning the age limit is stipulated as 01.01.2021. These two OAs are filed challenging the stipulation of the date of 01.01.2021 as the one for reckoning the age limit.

3. The applicants contend that once the CGLE is for the year 2020, the date ought to have been 01.01.2020 and there was no basis for the respondents to skip over to the next year. The applicants further contend that on



account of stipulation of such age limit, they became ineligible to take part in the examination. Reliance is placed upon an OM dated 14.07.1998 issued by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions.

4. We heard Shri Rajshekhar Rao for Shri Ashutosh Ghade, learned counsel for the applicants and Shri K. M. Singh and Ms. Anushree Kapadia for Shri Rajpal Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.

5. The issue in both the OAs is very limited, namely, whether the respondents were justified in stipulating the date of 01.01.2021, as the one for reckoning the age limit. It is no doubt true that the examination is being held for the year 2020, and in the normal course, the date of reckoning the age limit is required to be within that year itself. The fact, however, remains that on account of delay in conducting of examination few years ago, it is so happening that the examination referable to a particular year is being held in the next year and that,

in turn, necessitated the stipulation of the date, in the next year.



6. We would have certainly interfered in this matter and granted the relief to the applicant, if the respondents did not conduct any examination referable to each year. Irrespective of the nomenclature of the examination, it was being conducted year after year. It is also a matter of record that candidates who are within limits of age reckoned with reference to 1st January of each year are given an opportunity. Not a single year was omitted in this behalf. Once that is done, the applicant should not have any grievance. To be precise, the examination was held with reference to 01.01.2020, the insistence of stipulation of the same date for the present examination also, cannot be countenanced. That would result in a situation where the candidates within the age limits with reference to 01.01.2020, would have an opportunity twice whereas those with age limits referable to 01.01.2021 may lose it altogether.

7. We do not find any merit in the OAs. They are accordingly dismissed.



Pending MAs, if any, shall stand disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/pj/sunil/rk/vb/