

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

DA.No.1617/1987

Dated this the 31st January 1994.

Shri C.J. ROY, Hon. Member(J)  
Shri P.T. THIRUVENGADAM, Hon. Member(A)

Shri Raj Pal Singh,  
S/o Shri Ram Nath Singh,  
R/o C-1/25, Yamuna Vihar,  
Delhi-53.

Office Address:

The Directorate of Education,  
Delhi Administration,  
Old Secretariat,  
Delhi 110 054.

... Applicant

By Advocate Shri D.R. Gupta.

Versus

1. The Directorate of Education,  
Delhi Administration,  
Old Secretariat, Delhi 110 054.
2. Shri Liyaquat Ali,  
Village Jagatpur,  
Post Office urari, Delhi-9.
3. Ms. Neeru Sanduja,  
D/o Late Shri R.K. Sanduja,  
M-974, Saraswati Vihar, Delhi-34.
4. Mrs. Saneh Lata,  
W/o Shri V.K. Gupta,  
1367, Timarpur, 4 storeyed Bttrs.  
Delhi-9

... Respondents

By Advocates: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat for respondents No.1 & 2.  
Mrs. Kiran Suri for respondents No.3 & 4.

ORDER(Oral)

(delivered by Hon. Member(J) Shri C.J.ROY)

The case of the applicant is that he alongwith respondents No.2,3 and 4 and some others appeared for an interview for selection to the post of Yoga Teacher with respondent No.1. The recruitment rules provide that for selection of Yoga Teacher, the applicant should be a graduate and possess Diploma in Yoga of three months duration. The selection was held and more than 100 persons including both males and females were considered and 14 candidates were selected and have also joined the duty.

23

2. In OA 643 of 1988, filed by Mrs. Kanta Devi Vats and Another against D.S. Negi, Director of Education and others, the Principal Bench of the Central Administrative Tribunal delivered its judgement on 17.9.91. In this OA, a similar question was raised viz-a-viz <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ the respondents therein were not qualified for the post, yet they were selected because they belong to Delhi Administration. We have seen the judgement in OA 643/88 cited supra, in which, the recruitment rules have been considered and the same contentions were raised by the applicants therein against the respondents No.6,7 and 8 in that OA. Incidentally, in the instant case, it is admitted that the respondents No.2,3 and 4 are same to that of the respondents No.6,7 and 8 in OA 643/88.

3. In the circumstances, without going into the merit of the case, we proceed to dismiss this case because of a simple reason involving similar issues against the respondents No.6,7 and 8 in OA 643/88 and respondents No.2,3 and 4 in the present OA.No.1617/87, who are otherwise same. We are of the view that the already settled law cannot be unsettled now. The applicant has no locus standi to file this application because the judgement has become final. Had he been aggrieved, he should have filed a third party review against the judgement. But the applicant has not chosen to do so.

4. In the result, we see no merit in the application  
and dismiss it as devoid of merit with no order as to costs.

*P. T. Thiruvengadam*  
(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)  
MEMBER(A)  
31.1.94

*C. J. Roy*  
(C.J. ROY)  
MEMBER(J)  
31.1.94

kam.