

OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD.

Allahabad, this the 17th day of November, 2004.

QUORUM : HON. MR. JUSTICE S.R. SINGH, V.C.
HON. MR. D. R. TIWARI, A.M.

O.A. No. 841 of 2004

Bhoopesh Kumar Gupta, S/O Shri Prem Chandra Gupta, Iy/O
298/41-A/9-E/4, Tilak Nagar, Allahpur, Allahabad-211 006.

.....Applicant.

Counsel for applicant : Sri A.K. Dave.

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Defence,
Raksha Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. General Manager, Central Ordnance Depot, New Delhi.
3. The Commandant, Kendriya Ayudh Bhandar, Central Ordnance
Depot, Kanpur..... Respondents.

Counsel for respondents : Sri S. Singh.

O R D E R (ORAL)

BY HON. MR. JUSTICE S.R. SINGH, V.C.

Heard Sri A.K. Dave, learned counsel for applicant,
Sri S.K. Pandey holding brief of Sri S. Singh, Senior
Standing Counsel representing the Respondents and also
perused the pleadings.

2. The applicant herein had applied for the post of
Storekeeper pursuant to an advertisement issued by the
Central Ordnance Depot, Kanpur for appointment to the post
of Clerk, Storekeeper, Messenger and Majdoor. His applica-
tion form for the post of Storekeeper has been rejected by
impugned order dated 30.6.2004 (Annexure-1) on the ground
that 'the attestation has not been done by the competent
authority'.

3. The case of the applicant is that certificates
and other documents filed by the applicant, were duly
attested by Sri V.N. Srivastava, Audit Officer, working
in the office of Accountant General (Audit-I), U.P.,
Allahabad and in the absence ^{✓ of a provision} in the advertisement that

Ques

attestation should be done by a particular officer, the attestation by Sri V.N. Srivastava, Audit Officer, working in the office of AGUP, Allahabad ought not to have been ignored by the Respondents. Despite opportunity, C.A. has not been filed. The applicant was permitted by the Tribunal vide interim order dated 10.8.2004 to take the examination which was scheduled to be held on 26.8.2004. In case he has already taken the examination, he is entitled to declaration of his result.

4. Accordingly, the O.A. succeeds and is allowed. The impugned order dated 30.6.2004 is quashed. The Respondents shall declare the result of the applicant in case he has already taken the examination. It is further, made clear that this order will not preclude the Respondent to enquire about the genuineness of the certificates relied on by the applicant.

No order as to costs.

Dinesh
A.M.

Paranjpy
V.C.

Asthana/