

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH**

**OA/021/268/2021**

HYDERABAD, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021



**Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Judl. Member**  
**Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**

Shri D. Chandra Sekhar,  
S/o. Late Shri D. Ramaiah,  
Aged about 56 years,  
Working as Addl. Industrial Advisor,  
MSME Development Institute Govt. of India,  
Ministry of MSME Hyderabad.

...Applicant

(By Advocate :Sri K. Sudhakar Reddy)

Vs.

1. The Union of India rep. by  
Secretary MSME, Government of India,  
Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises,  
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi – 110 011.
2. The Joint Secretary (SME),  
Ministry of MSME, Government of India,  
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. Ms. S. Glory Swarupa,  
Director General,  
National Institute for Micro, Small &  
Medium Enterprises (NIMSME)  
Government of India, Ministry of MSME,  
Hyderabad.

....Respondents

(By Advocate: Smt K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC for Smt Megha Rani Agarwal,  
Addl. CGSC)

---

**ORAL ORDER**  
**(As per Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member)**

Through Video Conferencing:



Heard Sri K. Sudhakar Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant and Smt K. Rajitha, learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel representing Smt Megha Rani Agarwal, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. This case is about appointment to the post of Director General of National Institute for Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (NIMSME). The applicant was holding Additional charge of the post of Director General. However, Respondent No.3 was appointed. It is the contention of the applicant that, appointment of Respondent No.3 is illegal as many Rules have been violated in appointing her as Director General. Pointing out the violations and also the grounds on which applicant is eligible for the post of Director General (DG) a detailed representation dated 08.02.2021 was submitted to the respondents. In view of the representation submitted by the applicant, the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent is directed to dispose of the same as per the extant rules and in accordance with law by issuing a speaking and reasoned order, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

3. With the above direction, the OA, a copy of which is enclosed, is disposed of at the admission stage, without going into merits of the case. No order as to costs.

**(B.V. SUDHAKAR)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(ASHISH KALIA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

/al/

