



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

O.A. No. 796/2021

This the 5th Day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Akshay Sansanwal,
Age – 21
S/o Sh. Sanjay Kumar,
R/o F-27, Block — F, Katwaria Sarai,
Delhi
Mob - 9811621527 ...Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Tribindh Kumar)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi, Through its Secretary
Delhi Secretariat, Players Building
IP Estate, New Delhi
2. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board
Through its Chairperson
FC-18, Institutional Area,
Karkardooma, Delhi — 110092
3. South Delhi Municipal Corporation
Through its Commissioner
Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee Civic Centre,
Minto Road, Delhi — 110002.
4. Central Board of Secondary Education
Through its Competent Authority
CTET Unit, P5, 1-2 Institutional Area
I.P. Extension, Patparganj, Delhi — 110092.
5. National Institute for Empowerment of persons with
Multiple Disabilities (Divyangjan) (NIEPMD)
Through its Competent Authority
East Coast Road, Muttukadu,
Kovalam Post, Chennai - 603112

(By Advocates : Ms. Esha Mazumdar and Mr. R.K. Jain)



O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :

This OA is filed by the applicant with a prayer to direct the respondents to give one-time exemption to the applicant with regard to **CTET** qualification against the post code 32/20 Special Educator (Primary) by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD).

2. We heard Mr. Tribiridh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Esha Mazumdar and Mr. R.K. Jain, learned counsels for respondents, at the stage of admission.

3. The reasons stated by the applicant for seeking exemption is that no examination was held for CTET for the past seven years. This very contention was dealt with in detail in the case of **Himanshu Dabas Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi** (OA No. 300/ 2018) and was rejected through a detailed Order dated 14.03.2019. It is brought to our notice that the Order of the Tribunal was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court.

4. We, therefore, do not find any merit in the OA and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman