

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH,
ALLAHABAD

Dated : Allahabad this the 30th day of Oct.1996.

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member-A
Hon'ble Mr. T. L. Verma, Member-J

Original application No. 1121 of 1996.

Raj Kumar Yadav son of Sri
Ram Harak Yadava resident of
107/108, Jawahar Nagar, Kanpur.....applicant.
(THROUGH COUNSEL SRI N. MOHAN)

Versus

1. The Ordnance Equipment Factory,
through its General Manager,
Phoolbagh, Kanpur.
2. Sri C. P. Singh, Chairman,
Selection Committee,
Ordnance Equipment Factory,
Phoolbagh, Kanpur Nagar.....Respondents.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member-A)

Through this petition filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 the applicant has sought a direction that he be appointed on the post of Tailor in the ~~O.B.C.~~ O.B.C. category and that appointment order, if any, issued without declaration of the result, be cancelled.

...2/---

2x


Wf.

2. The facts averred in brief are that the applicant received training in the Ordnance Equipment Factory, Kanpur in the trade of Tailor for the period from 4.8.1983 to 2.3.1985 as an apprenticeship. He passed the examination and was granted National Apprenticeship Certificate in the trade of Tailor. The applicant got his name registered in the Employment Exchange. Subsequently vacancy arose in the said factory and the persons having certificate for Vocational Training Apprenticeship were called for interview as well as Machine test. The applicant was also called for interview and he appeared before the respondents on 2.8.1996. Subsequently he was again called for final interview on 3.9.96. The applicant has claimed that according to his knowledge he was selected and was awaiting appointment letter. His grievance is that he has not so far received any appointment letter whereas certain other persons who were also interviewed after, already been asked to join. The applicant has also alleged that no result of the interview was published. He submitted a representation on 4.10.1996, copy of which is Annexure-A-1. As no reply was received to the representation, the applicant has approached this Tribunal for the aforesaid reliefs.

3. We heard the learned counsel for the applicant at the admission stage. We are of the view that so far no cause of action has arisen, There is nothing to show that the applicant was actually selected or that the persons ^F lesser merit

than the applicant, have been appointed. We have noted that he had submitted representation only on 4.10.1996 and without waiting for a reply, he has rushed to the Tribunal. The application is pre-mature and therefore, cannot be entertained at this stage.

4. In view of the foregoing, this application is dismissed at this stage as being pre-mature. Nothing in this order will preclude the applicant from approaching the Tribunal in case any cause of action actually arises.



MEMBER (J)



MEMBER (A)

Dt. 30th Oct. 1996.

(Pandey)