

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 1163/92.

Date of decision 29.10.92

Shri Raj Veer Singh ... Applicant

v/s

Union of India & ... Respondents
Others.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ram Pal Singh, Vice-Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Mr. I.P. Gupta, Member (A)

For the Applicant ... Shri S.S. Vats, counsel

For the Respondents ... Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat,
counsel.

(1) Whether Reporters of local papers may be
allowed to see the Judgement ?

(2) To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

J_U_D_G_E_M_E_N_T

Delivered by Hon'ble Shri I.P. Gupta, Member (A)

file

In this application filed under Section 19
of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 the appli-
cant has requested for issue of directions to the
respondents to issue appointment letter to the
applicant for the post of TGT (Mathematics) in
Government schools of Delhi Administration on the
basis of merit list as published on 30.7.1991. The

respondents had advertised, among others, the post of Trained Graduate Teacher to be appointed in the Government schools of Delhi Administration. The number of posts was 1916 as mentioned in the Indian Express dated 1st July, 1990. The contention of the applicant is that he was eligible to apply as he had the requisite qualification and was within the prescribed age limit. Written test for appointment was held on 24.3.1991. The applicant appeared and his roll number was 210496. 85 marks were fixed for written test, 10 marks for experience in teaching in recognized schools and 5 marks were reserved for Teachers' ward. The list of the selected candidates as published (Annexure VII) showed that the applicant had qualified. The list of selected candidates was published in the newspapers and was displayed on the notice board.

2. The published result did mention that it was the result of the selection test but the appointment letter would be issued after verification of documents. It also mentioned therein that 10 marks were kept for experience.

3. The Learned Counsel for the respondents

said that entire evaluation of the answer sheets was done by different computer agencies. On receipt of result from the agencies, a provisional list of candidates was displayed and the candidates were informed to get their testimonials and other particulars verified. During scrutiny of the result received from the computer agencies, the applicant had secured 27 marks in written examination and 10 marks in experience for teaching. Accordingly, the candidate was asked to submit the proof of benefit of marks for teaching but he failed to do so. These 10 marks given to him for teaching experience were deducted from the total marks secured and the candidate was out of the merit list. The Learned Counsel for the respondents also drew attention to the rejoinder filed by the applicant where it has been said that the applicant did his B.Ed. in 1987 and, therefore, how could it be expected that he had experience of 10 years. One mark for one year teaching was allotted.

from the respondents

4. As ascertained there was a mistake done by the computer in giving 10 out of 10 marks to the applicant in experience. One mark was for one year

ml

of teaching experience. The applicant himself has accepted that he did not have 10 years teaching experience. The correction was accordingly made by the respondents. The intimation to him was that he was provisionally qualified in the written test but he should be advised to contact the Controller of Exam. for verification of original certificates/documents along with duly attested photo copies of each and in the course of verification, the mistake was detected. Of course, the mistake cannot be attributed to the applicant as he had correctly stated in regard to his experience. The mistake was of the computer which was corrected on scrutiny of documents. In the circumstances, we find no illegality in the action of the respondents. The application is, therefore, dismissed with no order as to costs.

5. The above order has been given on the basis of the pleadings on record and the arguments of the counsel for the respondents as the counsel for the applicant was not present even on second call, after a pass over nor had he sent any intimation about adjustment of date.

I.P. Gupta
I.P. Gupta
Member (A) 29.10.92

Ram Pal Singh
Ram Pal Singh
Vice Chairman (J)