

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH
JABALPUR

Original Application No.200/00437/2021

Jabalpur, this Thursday, the 05th day of August, 2021

HON'BLE SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MS. NAINI JAYASEELAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



Preetam Acharjee
Mihir Acharjee aged about 27 years
Occupation Student R/o village Telai
Post Kachni Tahasil and
District Singrouli (MP) PIN

-Applicant

(By Advocate –**Shri Mahesh Shukla**)

V e r s u s

1. Union of India,
Through the General Manager
South Western Railway Bangalore
(Karnatka) 580020

2. The Chairman
Railway Recruitment Board
Bengaluru No.18
Millers Road
Bangalore 560048

3. Chief Medical Superintendent
South Western Railway
Hubli Karnataka 580020

- Respondents

(By Advocate –**Shri A.S.Raizada**)

O R D E R (Oral)**By Ramesh Singh Thakur, JM:-**

Heard.

2. This Original Application has been filed against the respondents for not deciding the Annexure A-5 which is a representation dated 26.01.2021 made by the applicant.



3. Precisely the case of the applicant is that the applicant appears in the Centralized Employment Notice 01/2018 Exam organized by Railway Recruitment Board Bengaluru on 10.05.2019. The applicant succeeded in the said exam. The applicant has been called for document verification and medical examination for ALP/Technician posts against CEN 01/2018 by letter dated 19.08.2019 wherein appearance has been assigned on 06.09.2019. Accordingly the applicant has appeared on the said date. The respondent No.3 recommended that the applicant a candidate for RRB/ALP/TECH in Ae One (A-1) and Bee One (B-1) medical categories may be made unfit and recommendation is accepted by PCMD/UBL on 28.07.2020. The applicant has made his eye check up from private medical institution by Dr. Arnab Pal, Susrut Eye Foundation & Research Centre where he has found no such type of issue is availed in the eye of the applicant as assigned by respondent No.3 So it is very clearly evident that the eye

examination made by the respondents is not just and proper a copy of which is annexed as Annexure A-4. The applicant has submitted representation dated 26.01.2021 to the respondents to give an opportunity to have a fair check up of both the eye of the applicant but the respondents did not paid any heed on the request of the applicant.



4. Counsel for the respondents made an objection that the certificate procured from the private doctor is not permissible.

5. We have considered the matter and we are of the view that the natural justice will be met if the competent authority of the respondents are directed to re-examine the applicant in view of Annexure A-4 in a time bound manner.

6. Resultantly, the competent authority of the respondents is directed to constitute a medical board and re-examine the applicant in view of Annexure A-4.

7. The said exercise be done within a period of four weeks positively.

8. With these observations, this Original Application is disposed of at admission stage itself.

9. Needless to say that this Tribunal has not commented anything on the merits of the case.

10. Applicant is directed to make available copy of today's order as well as copy of Original Application to the competent authority of the respondents.



(Naini Jayaseelan)
Administrative Member

rn

(Ramesh Singh Thakur)
Judicial Member