

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
N E W D E L H I

O.A. No. 1349/90
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 31.08.1990.

Shri Dinesh Chander Goel Petitioner

Shri O.P. Khokha Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Public Service Commission Respondent

Shri N.S. Mehta, Sr. Counsel Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K. CHAKRAVORTY, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? Y
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? N
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? /M
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? /M

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

(of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri D.K. Chakravorty, Administrative Member)

Heard the learned counsel of both parties. The prayer contained in this application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 is that the Union Public Service Commission should be directed to call the applicant for interview for the post of Assistant Engineer in the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking. The applicant is presently working as an Assistant Director in the Bureau of Indian Standards in Delhi.

2. The Union Public Service Commission has been impleaded as the sole respondent. Shri N.S. Mehta, the learned counsel

3
appearing for the respondents has raised the preliminary objection as regards the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to entertain the present application as the relief sought is not against any impugned order passed by the Union of India. The applicant is not seeking relief from the Union of India. His grievance is against the non-selection by the Union Public Service Commission for a post in the DESU. Admittedly, the DESU is not amenable to the jurisdiction of this Tribunal, as no notification has been issued under Section 14(2) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, extending the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to DESU.

3. In the circumstances of the case, we feel that this is not a service matter to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. The applicant may, if he is so advised, move the appropriate legal forum to seek redress in accordance with law. The application is dismissed as not maintainable on the ground of jurisdiction with liberty to the applicant to move the appropriate legal forum in accordance with law, if so advised.

There will be no order as to costs.

D.K. Chakravorty
(D.K. CHAKRAVORTY)
MEMBER (A)

P.K. Kartha
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)