



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.800/2021

This the 6thday of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Bhupender Singh,
Aged 35 years: Post Manager (Traffic) Class-B,
S/o Late Sh. Rajender Singh,
H.No.53, Vill. Budhpur,
P.O.- Alipur, New Delhi-36.

...Applicant

(By Advocate:Mr.J.S. Mann)

Versus

1. Chief Secretary,
Govt. of NCT
Players Building, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi.
2. Chairman,
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,
FC-18, Institutional Area,
Kadkadduma, Delhi-110 302.
3. Chairman,
Delhi Transport Corporation (HQS),
I.P. Estate,
New Delhi-110 002.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Ms. Esha Mazumdar for R-1&2
Mr. Manish Garg for R-3.)



ORDER (Oral)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The Delhi Transport Corporation (DTC), Respondent No. 3 herein, intended to appoint the Manager (Traffic). The selection process was entrusted to Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB), the 2nd respondent herein. An advertisement in this behalf was issued on 20.10.2015. The applicant was one of the candidates. Apart from stipulating the educational qualifications, the advertisement indicated the nature of experience, which a candidate must hold to his credit. The written test was conducted and the applicant took part therein. He was also within the range of selection. At the stage of verification of the documents, the 2nd respondent found that the applicant did not have to his credit, the prescribed experience. Accordingly, his candidature was rejected.

2. Complaining that he has not been selected, the applicant filed OA No. 1221/2020. That was disposed of on 04.09.2020, with a direction to the respondents to consider his candidature. Thereafter, he filed OA No. 1771/2020. When that was pending, the respondents passed an order dated 16.10.2020, rejecting the candidature of the applicant.

The OA was dismissed as withdrawn and the applicant was permitted to make a representation.

Accordingly, he made a representation on 21.12.2020. That was answered through a letter dated 12.01.2021, referring to the order dated 16.10.2020.

2. It is stated by the respondents that the applicant indicated the name of M/s Giriraj Transport as the agency, as the place, where he worked, whereas the certificate furnished by him was issued by a different Agency altogether. It is also further mentioned that the experience mentioned in the certificate, even otherwise, does not conform to the requirements. This OA is filed challenging the order dated 12.01.2021 and thereby the order dated 16.10.2020.

3. We heard Shri J.S. Mann, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel for respondents No.1&2 and Shri Manish Garg, learned counsel for respondent No.3.

4. It has already been mentioned that apart from the educational qualifications, the respondents have indicated the nature of experience, which a candidate must hold. The relevant column reads as under :-

7.	Educational and other qualifications	<u>Essential :</u> i) Degree of a recognized University or equivalent.
----	--------------------------------------	---



Item No.7



	required for direct recruitment	<p>ii) At least 3 years experience of Supervisory duties in a Traffic Department of a State Road Transport Corporation/Undertaking or of some other important road transport concern.</p> <p><u>Desirable :</u></p> <p>Knowledge of Planning of routes, framing of schedules and other allied matters. (Qualifications relaxable at the discretion of the competent authority in case of candidates otherwise well qualified.</p>
--	---------------------------------	--

5. In the relevant column of his application, the applicant mentioned the name of M/s Giriraj Transport. However, during the course of verification of documents, he filed a certificate issued by a different Agency, namely, Khatri Logistic. There again, the certificate is one, which does not accord, with the stipulation. Once the applicant has not furnished the certificate issued by the Agency mentioned by him in the application form, the necessity to make any further verification does not exist. The respondents have verified that certification also. A perusal of the same discloses that it is quite vague.

Item No.7

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

(Aradhana Johri) (Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Member (A) Chairman

lg/jyoti/rk/akshaya/sd

