

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No. 1614 of 1993

New Delhi, this the 11th day of December, 1998


Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. N. Sahu, Member (Admnv)

1. Sh. Manoj Kumar, S/o Sh. Jai Narain, R/o Vill. & P.O. Patoda, Teh. Jhajjar, Rohtak (Haryana).
2. Sh. Surinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Risal Singh, Vill. & P.O. Ranila (Pana Sahu), Distt. Bhiwani (Haryana)

-APPLICANTS

(By Advocate -None) -

Versus

1. The Commissioner of Police, Police Head Quarter, M.S.O. Building, Indra Prastha, New Delhi.
2. The Delhi Administration Through Secretary Home, 5, Alipur Road, New Delhi.
3. The Union of India Through Secretary Home, North Block, New Delhi.
4. The D.C.P., IIIrd Battalion, Delhi Armed Police, Kingsway Camp, New Delhi.

-RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate -None)

O R D E R (Oral)

By Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J) -

This case is listed at serial no. 16 in the today's cause list under regular matters under the heading "Cases of the Year 1993 & earlier to that will not be adjourned". Today none ^{has} ₂ appeared for either side. Even on 26.11.1998 none had appeared for the applicants and we had ordered that the case to remain on daily board and not to be called before 11.12.1998. We note that this case had already once been dismissed earlier for non-prosecution by an order dated 25.8.1993. Later the case was restored to the file to be heard on merits.

PS

2. Taking into account the nature of the reliefs prayed and the fact that neither the applicants nor their counsel have appeared on successive dates, it appears that the applicants are no longer interested in pursuing the matter of appointment after the lapse of about four years. In view of the above we could have dismissed the matter for non-prosecution. However, we have perused the pleadings.

3. The applicants have sought a direction to the respondents to supply them the mark sheet of written test and interview conducted for the post of Constable in Delhi Police in 1991/1992 and consequential reliefs. The representations made by them have been rejected by the respondents.

4. From the documents on record we note that the respondents have submitted that the overall performance of the applicants was not upto the mark fixed by the Selection Board. Hence they have submitted that the applicants are not entitled to relief as they have not been declared qualified in first as well the supplementary list. We find that no enforceable rights of the applicants have been infringed so as to justify any interference in the matter. As we also find no merit in this application, the same is dismissed. No costs.

N.Sahu
(N.Sahu)
Member (Admnv)

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)