

(2)
OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

DATED : THIS THE 6TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1996

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 947 of 1996

Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta AM
CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. T. L. Verma JM
- - - - -

Ugrasen Pratap Singh
s/o Sri Ghan Shyam Singh alias Ghisiyavan, Singh,
resident of 592, Purana Katra,
Allahabad.

2. Devendra Deo Gupta son of
Sri Ram Deo Prasad Gupta,
R/O 18-A Nawab Yusuf Road,
Civil Lines, Allahabad. Applicants

C/A Sri D. D. Gupta.

VERSUS

Union of India the Secretary,
U. P. S. C., New Delhi. Respondent

C/R.

ORDER

By Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta AM

This application has been inter-alia
filed by two applicants seeking a direction to the
respondent to consider the case of the applicants
for revaluation of their answer sheets in the Civil
Service preliminary examination of 1996. The case of
the applicants is that they had appeared in the
aforesaid examination held by the U. P. S. C. on

wl,

9.6.1996. They were confident to be successful in the said examination as all the questions were solved properly without any mistake, but inspite of this their names were not amongst the list of successful candidates. They submitted representation on 30.7.1996 to the U. P. S. C. for revaluation of their answer sheets, but no action has been taken on their representations. Hence this application for the relief aforementioned.

2. When the case came up for admission, the only ground, which the learned counsel for the applicant advanced was seeking our interference was that both the applicants are brilliant students and had been successful in the ~~previous~~^{State} Civil Service examination. Success and failure in ~~the~~ competitive examination does not necessarily depend on the academic brilliance of the candidate. Nor it can be said merely because the candidates had been successful in some examination, they must be successful in other competitive examination also. There is no allegation of malafide on the part of the respondent in valuation of the answer books of the applicants. Merely because in their own assessment they have done well in the examination can ~~not~~ ^{not} be hardly be a reason to interfere and to direct the respondent to revalue~~te~~ their answer papers. Neither the applicants have made any averments nor the

W.C.

the learned counsel for the applicants advanced any argument, indicating that there is any rule under which such revaluation is permissible.

3. We, therefore, hold that the applicants have utterly failed to make out any case for our interference and therefore, this application is dismissed in limine.

J. M.

A. M.

SQI