

Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi



C.P. No. 278/2019 in
O.A. No. 935/2018

Friday, this the 04th day of December, 2020

Through video conferencing

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

Seema Shilk (Appointment)
Roll No. 49001108
Aged about 34 years
D/o Sh. Inde Jeet Shilk
R/o Flat No. 97, Peepal Apartment
Sec-17, Pkt-E, Dwarka, Delhi.Petitioner

(Through ShriM.K. Bhardwaj, Advocate)

Versus

1. Sh. Anshu Prakash, Chief Secretary
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Delhi Secretariat, IP Estate, Delhi.
2. Sh. V.K. Singh, Chairman
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board
FC-18, Karkardoma, Institutional Area
Delhi – 110092.
3. Ms. Saumya Gupta, Director
Directorate of Education
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Old Secretariat, New Delhi.

..Respondents

(Through Ms. Esha Mazumdar, for respondent Nos. 1 and 3 and Shri Sameer Sharma, for respondent No. 2, Advocates)

ORDER (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant took part in the selection for the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) (Natural Science) (Female) with Post Code No.113/12. It is stated that the applicant was in the wait-list and several vacancies arose in September, 2017 on account of failure of the selected candidates to join the duty. She filed OA No. 935/2018 claiming various reliefs.

That OA was disposed of on 08.01.2019 directing that in case, there existed any vacancy in the OBC category in the said post, the case of the applicant shall be considered as per her own merit and to pass a reasoned and speaking order, within ninety days. This contempt case is filed alleging that the respondents did not comply with the directions issued in the OA.

2. On behalf of the respondents, reply is filed. It is stated that the selection process for the post code No. 113/12 came to an end and in the subsequent year, a written test was conducted on 27.09.2018. The respondents have also stated through a separate affidavit that the applicant had taken part in the subsequent examination but was not successful.

3. We heard Shri M.K. Bhardwaj, learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel for



respondent Nos. 1 and 3 and Shri Sameer Sharma, learned counsel for respondent No. 2.

4. The direction issued in the OA was that the case of the applicant be considered if there existed a vacancy. The selection process commenced way back in the year 2012 and for some reason or the other, it continued till the year 2017. It is no doubt true that some selected candidates did not join and the user department has addressed letters in September, 2017 with a request to send the dossiers of the other candidates in the merit. The fact, however, remains that much before any tangible steps were taken, vacancies were carried forward to the next year and the examination was held on 27.09.2018. It is also stated that the applicant had taken part in the examination, but was not successful.

5. We do not find any contempt of court on the part of the respondents and the contempt case is accordingly closed.

(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

