



Central Administrative Tribunal Jammu Bench, Jammu

TA No.6022/2021
(SWP No. 935/2011)

Tuesday, this the 13th day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)

Upasana Sharma, Aged 36 years
D/o Sh. Girdhari Lal Sharma
W/o Sanjay Jamwal
R/o H.No.26, Mohalla Jullaka
Gali Hakeem Param Ram
Jain Bazar, Jammu.

...Applicant

(Mr. Arshad Majid Malik, Advocate)

Versus

1. The State of Jammu and Kashmir
Through its Commissioner/Secretary to
Education Department
Civil Secretariat, Jammu.
2. The Jammu and Kashmir Service Selection Board
Through its Secretary
Sekhari Bhawan, Rail Head Complex
Near Bahu Plaza, Jammu.
3. The Chairman
Jammu and Kashmir Service Selection Board
Sekhari Bhawan, Rail Head Complex
Near Bahu Plaza, Jammu.
4. The Division Officer
Jammu and Kashmir Service Selection Board
1-DC, Green Belt Park
Gandhi Nagar, Jammu.

Item No. 15



5. The Chairman/Convenor of the Committee Constituted for the purposes of interviewing the candidates for the post of teachers District Cadre Jammu advertised (item No.696) vide No.07 of 2010 dated 12-11-2010.

...Respondents

(Mr. Rajesh Thappa, Deputy Advocate General)

ORDER (ORAL)

Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant filed SWP No. 935/2011 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir, with a prayer to direct the respondents to interview her for the post of Teacher District Cadre, Jammu. The applicant pleaded that though she was otherwise eligible, she was not shortlisted for interview. The Hon'ble High Court passed an interim order dated 02.05.2011, directing the respondents to interview the applicant and process her case, at her own risk and responsibility.

2. The SWP has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of the reorganisation of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and renumbered as T.A. No. 6022/2021.

3. Today, we heard Mr. Arshad Majid Malik, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Rajesh Thappa, learned Deputy Advocate General.

Item No. 15



4. The shortlisting of the candidates for the interview was on the basis of the marks awarded to the candidates under various heads, pertaining to educational qualifications. The grievance of the applicant is that though she holds the B.Ed. Degree, no marks were awarded to that.

5. The respondents prescribed the educational qualifications for the post. B.Ed. was not an independent Graduation or Post Graduation Degree. It is almost a training course. As a uniform policy, the respondents did not award any marks to B.Ed. Degree. The applicant cannot claim exception for that. More than a decade has elapsed since the selection has taken place.

6. We do not find any merit in the T.A. and accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

July 13, 2021
/sunil/jyoti/