

(5)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

OA 1328/87

Date of decision: 11-1-93.

Bhim Sain

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Another

...Respondents

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S.MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.
THE HON'BLE MR. S.R.ADIGE, MEMBER(A).

For the applicant

...None

For the respondents

...Shri P.P.Khurana, Counsel

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S.Malimath, Chairman) :

The grievance of the petitioner is that he was suffering from ailment of the eye and, therefore, he had made an application for postponement of the trade test and that without considering his request, the petitioner's claim has been unreasonably rejected. The respondents have denied the allegation stating that he did not make any such application before the Selection Board for postponing the trade test on the ground of his problem on the eye. It is stated in the reply that he submitted his identity card and submitted himself for the trade test and was duly questioned. It is stated that having regard to the nature given, he secured zero marks. There is no reason to disbelieve authorities. There is also no reason to give a biased or a the petitioner by the respondents. It, therefore, flows that make any request for postponement of the trade test and he actual the trade test and failed. That being the position, he is not relief. This petition, therefore, fails and is dismissed. No costs.

S.R. Adige
(S.R.ADIGE)
MEMBER(A)

V.S. Malimath
(V.S.MALIMATH)
CHAIRMAN

'PKK'/
120193.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

OA 1328/87

Bhim Sain

Date of decision: 11-1-93.

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Another

...Respondents

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S.MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN.
THE HON'BLE MR. S.R.ADIGE, MEMBER(A).

For the applicant

...None

For the respondents

...Shri P.P.Khurana, Counsel

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S.Malimath, Chairman) :

The grievance of the petitioner is that he was suffering from ailment of the eye and, therefore, he had made an application for postponement of the trade test and that without considering his request, the petitioner's claim has been unreasonably rejected. The respondents have denied the allegation stating that he did not make any such application before the Selection Board for postponing the trade test on the ground of his problem on the eye. It is stated in the reply that he submitted his identity card and submitted himself for the trade test and that he was duly questioned. It is stated that having regard to the nature of the answers given, he secured zero marks. There is no reason to disbelieve the version of the authorities. There is also no reason to give a biased or a false version against the petitioner by the respondents. It, therefore, flows that the petitioner did not make any request for postponement of the trade test and he actually participated in the trade test and failed. That being the position, he is not entitled to any relief. This petition, therefore, fails and is dismissed. No costs.

(S.R.ADIGE)
MEMBER(A)

(V.S.MALIMATH)
CHAIRMAN

'PKK'
120193.