

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. 1218/92

Date of decision: 4/1/93

Nilotpol

.. Applicant

versus

Union Public Service

Commision

.. Respondents.

Sh.A.Bhattacharjee

.. Counsel for the applicant.

Sh.Jog Singh with

Ms.Jaswinder Kaur

.. Counsel for the respondents.

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Sh.Justice Ram Pal Singh, Vice Chairman(J).

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

J U D G E M E N T (ORAL)

In this application, filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, the applicant has prayed for an order directing the respondents to call the applicant to appear in the selection test for the advertised post of Assistant Engineer in Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking. The advertisement had said that one of the minimum eligibility qualification was two years professional experience in a large electric supply undertaking. Since the number of applications received by the U.P.S.C. was very large, applications of eligible candidates were considered keeping the number of posts in view and a short list was prepared for being called for interview. It was brought out in the Employment News concerning the publications of the advertisement that where the number of applications received was large and it would not be convenient or possible for the Commission to interview all the candidates, the Commission might restrict the number of candidates to a reasonable limit on the basis of either qualification or experience higher than the minimum prescribed in the advertisement

contd...2p...

or on the basis of experience in the relevant field.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents contended that only those candidates who had experience in the Departments/Organizations which were Electric Supply Undertakings <sup>or</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>able</sup> compared thereto, have been taken into consideration. The applicant was duly considered at the time of scrutiny. But since his experience in a large Electric Supply Undertaking fell short of three years, he was not called for interview.

3. We cannot find any fault with the criteria adopted by U.P.S.C. considering the very large number of applications which they have received, Shortlisting has to be done which means all the candidates were considered and a list of lesser number of candidates <sup>who</sup> ~~were~~ prepared. We find that the petitioner has not been discriminated <sup>against</sup> and there is a rational basis which has been adopted by the U.P.S.C. This petition is accordingly, dismissed with no order as to costs. This order is also consistent with the orders passed by Delhi High Court vide C.W. 1759/92 dated 10.8.92 and is borne <sup>out</sup> ~~by~~ <sup>me</sup> by the records produced by the respondents for the scrutiny of the Bench.

*I. P. Gupta*  
(I.P. GUPTA) 4/1/93  
MEMBER(A)

*Ram Pal Singh*  
(RAM PAL SINGH)  
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)