

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD.

\*\*\*\*\*

Allahabad this the 26th day of September 1996.

Original application No. 325 of 1996.

Hon'ble Dr. R.K. Saxena, JM  
Hon'ble Mr. D.S. Baweja, AM

Dinesh Kumar Chaturvedi, a/a 30 years,  
S/o Sri Swarup Narayan Chaturvedi,  
R/o Kayam Ganj, Farrukhabad.

..... Applicant.

C/A Sri P.C. Mishra

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager,  
Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. Railway Recruitment Board, S.C.O.-78-79,  
Sec. 8C Chandigarh through Chairman.

..... Respondents.

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Dr. R.K. Saxena, JM

This O.A. has been filed by Dinesh Kumar Chaturvedi challenging the selection on the post of Law Assistants in Northern Railway. The grievance of the applicant in this case is that he had applied for the post of Law Assistant in pursuance of the notification of the Railway Recruitment Board, Chandigarh. He had appeared in the written test and was also interviewed but when the final result was published, his name was not in the list of candidates who were finally selected.

Contd...2...

2

Feeling aggrieved by the result, he has approached the Tribunal on the ground that the Recruitment Board had not provided maximum marks for written and interview and thus there was arbitrariness. The ground taken is also that the candidates were arbitrarily called for interview and that the evaluation of the answer book of the applicant vis-à-vis other successful candidates, be made.

2. This O.A. was filed on 11.3.96 and since then it was pending for admission. It was listed on 22.3.96, 9.4.96, 26.7.96, 5.8.96, 19.8.96 and today. On most of the dates, the learned counsel for the applicant was not present. He however appeared on 22.3.96 and 5.8.96. The adjournment was sought and was granted. Today the applicant appears in person and informs that his counsel has refused to appear on his behalf. He was asked if he wanted time to engage another lawyer but he pressed for his arguments being heard. He was therefore allowed to argue. We heard his arguments.

3. The main contention of the applicant is that only 18 candidates have been finally selected and in view of the law laid down in Ashok Kumar Yadav Vs. State of Haryana AIR 1987 Supreme Court page 454, the candidates not more than two to three times, should have been called for interview. According to the admission of the applicant himself, 57 candidates were called for interview and thus number exceeded by only three persons. We are not convinced with the contention of the applicant that because three persons exceeded the limit, the whole of the selection should be quashed. His further contention that answer-books should be made, is also unwarranted. In view of these facts, we do not find any substance and the O.A. is dismissed.

Member - A

Member - J