CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

Orininal	Applicat	tion Not	375	af 1992	
		01011 1100	3,0		Annliannta
S.K.Dixi	10 6 93	and to o		• • • • • • • •	Applicants.
		Versus			
Union of	India &	ethers.			Respondents.
		WITH			
Driginal	Applicat	tion No:	376	of 1992	
P.K.Dube	1 x 7 1 5				Applicants.
1 1112000	,	Versus		• • • • • • •	"ppileence"
No.	V - 11 - V				D
union of	India &		* "	• • • • • • • •	Respondents.
		WITH		•	
Original	Applicat	tion No:	460	of 1992	
M.K. Vyas					Applicants.
		Versus			
Union of	India &	ethers			Respondents.
		WITH			
0-1-1-2	0 214		451	- 6 4000	
	Applicat	lon Ne:	401		
V.K.Katr	2			• • • • • • •	Applicants.
		Versus			¥
Union of	India &	ethers		• • • • • • •	Respondents
•		WITH .			
Original	Applicat	ien Ne:	462	of 1992	
O.P.Kush	-				Applicants.
-		Versus			/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /
11-1	Touldan 8				0
Union or	India &			• • • • • • •	Respondents.
		WITH			
Original	Applicat	ion No:	463	ef 1992	
A.K.Sriv	astava				Applicants.
		Versus			
Union of	India &	ethers			Respondents.
		WITH			
Oniciani	Applicat		464	af 1002	
	•	TOH HE.	404		A
B.V.Galv				• • • • • • • •	Applicants.
,		Versus			
Union of	India &	ethers		• • • • • • •	Respondents.
		WITH			*
Original	Applicat	ion No:	465	ef 1992	
Smt. H.L.					Applicants.
Sill Se Trete		Versus			ppaadelioot
	Tanks .				0
Outon of	India &				Respondents.
		WITH			
Original	Applicat	ien Ne:	466	sf 1992	
Harish Ku	lmar			• • • • • • •	Applicants.
		Versus			
Union of	India &	ethers		• • • • • • •	Respondents.
		WITH			

4

Original Application No; 467 of 1992 S.K.Shukle Applicants. Versus Respendents. Union of India & others WITH Original Application No: 468 of 1992 Surendra Kumar Applicants. Versus Union of India & others Respondents. WITH Original Application No: 469 of 1992 0.8. Magha Applicants. Versus Union of India & others Respondents. WITH Original Application NO: 470 of 1992 A.B. Khanwalker Applicants. Versus Union of India & others Respondents. OWITH: Original Application No: 471 of 1992 B.K.Bhatta Applicants. Versus Respendents. Union of India & others Original Application No: 472 of 1992 Applicants. B.R.Singh Versus Union of India & others Respondents. WITH Original Application No: 473 if 1992 R.P.Gupta Applicants. Versus Union of India & others Respondents. WITH Original Application No: 474 of 1992 R.K. Tewari Applicants. Versus Respendents. Union of India & others

WITH

4

Original Application No: 374 of 1992

T.KwMishra

Versus

Unian of India & others

Respondents

Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C. Hon'ble Mr. K.Obayya. Member-A

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice, U.C.Srivastava, V.C.)

Shri C.P.Srivastava has put in appearance in this case and has prayed for disposal of the case. The learned counsel for the respondents Shri P.Mathur prays for time to file Counter Affidavit. It is not necessary to grant time for the same as similar matter has been disposed of by the Bombay Bench and as well as Allahabad Bench. Therefore, the prayer of the learned counsel for the respondents is refused and the case is being decided by hearing the counsels for the parties.

In this case, after hearing, we are of the 2. opinion that, the judgement which is delivered at Bombay and which has been followed here at Allahabad will hold good. The applicant appeared in a written test of Office Clerk in response to an advertisement issued by the Railway Service Commission, Bombay. The examination took place at various centres, the applicant was declared successful in the written test and called for interview. The applicant was declared successful in the selection for the post of Office Clerk. Commission
The Railway service Bombay informed the applicant that his name has been sent to the Central Railways for appointment as Office Clerk. After waiting for a considerable period when the applicant did not get appointment, the applicant

W

3.

approached the authorities and was told that certain enquiries in the irregularities which took place are going on and he should wait for some time more. Lateron, a fresh list was published on 21.12.1986 in the Indian Express — and the name — of the applicant did not figure in the list. He represented against the same, but after failing to get any response a legal notice was sent and thereefter this application was filed before this Tribunal with a prayer that the respondents may be directed to offer appointment to him on the post of Office Clerk or upon any other equivalent post on the basis of his result as declared by the Railway service commission.

In the written statement filed by the

respondents it has been stated that the cause of action arose and examination was conducted by the Railway Recruitment Board, Bombay and as such in no administration. case the present petition is cognizable by the/ In the vigilance enquiry certain tempering were found with the result the applicant's name was dropped and the that's why, he was not given appointment. In case, his appointment would have been given, a communication would have been made. Undoubtedly, maximum has because the person/passed the examination, he or she, as the case may be, and the result declared then the applicant should not have been dropped without any valid reason. If there was some foul play in the inclusion of his name, obviously, the applicant was to be given an epportunity or he should have been apprised of the necessary facts to enable him to submit reply and meet anything which was against him. But on the basis of the Vigilance Enquiry,

the applicant should not have been deprived from the appointment in which he became entitled against one of the vacancies which was advertised. person should be deprived of his rights which accrued or which necessarily will accrue on account of the foul play by the authorities unless he is not guilty or he was not given an opportunity of hearing. Accordingly, the application is allowed and the respondents are directed to held an enquiry into the matter associating the applicant with the same and in case no foul play on his partiis found the applicant should not have been deprived of his appointment because someone has been found guilty. The enquiry should be completed within three months from the date of communication of this order. In case, the entire examination has been cancelled and none of those who appeared in the examination got the appointment then the applicant will have no case of his appointment. But in case, some appointments have been made and every case has to be decided on merits as indicated above, the enquiry about the applicant's case may be made within three months from the date of communication of this order. Inscase, some of the persons are required to appear in Viva-Voce test and their written examination is accepted, but has not been cancelled. they may appear in the Viva-Voce examination. This is a part of the selection itself and incase they succeed their result may be declared and they may be given appointment accordingly. The application stands disposed with these directions. No order as to costs.

W

..... Contd/- 4

Copy of the judgement shall be placed on every

Vice-Chairman

Allahabad Dated: 9.2.1993

(JW)



31.5.1993 Hon. Mr. Justice R.K. Varma, V.C.
Hon. Mr. K. Chayya, Member(A)

By this application the petitioner Uma Kant Katre seeks correction of his hame in the order dated 9.2.1993 passed in original application No. 461/92 Umakant Katre Vs. Union of India and Others . On perusal of the original application No. 461/92, the name of petitioner written as Umakant Ramchandra Katre but it appears that in the order passed on this application the petitioner's name has been wrongly typed as V.K. Katra. Accordingly, it is ordered that the petitioner's name in the order dated 9.2.93 passed in O.A. No. 461/92 shall be read as U.K. Katre and not V.K. Katra as wrongly typed. The original application no. 461/92 was disposed of alongwith similar other applications by a common order dated 9.2.93 and in that the petitioner in O.A. . No. 461/92 has been wrongly mentioned as V.K. Katra instead of U.K. Katre.

Accordingly, the correction be made today. Corrected copy of the order may be issued to the petitioner today.

A.M.

R. K. Varma

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

	*					
	Original	Applica	tion No:	375	of 1992	
menaga -	S.K.Dixi	t				Applicants.
			Versus			
	Union of	India &	ethers.			Respondents.
			WITH			
	Driginal	Applica	tien Ne:	376	of 1992	
of all and and and and	P.K.Dube		i i i i i	e di ilu		Applicants.
•	, surende	*	Versus		• • • • • • •	"pprzemitos.
	Union of	India &				Passandents
	OHII OF	THULE O	WITH		• • • • • • •	Respondents.
	Original	Analica		460	ef 1002	•
		ubbire	CTEN NO.	400		A1:+-
	M.K.Vyas		V		*****	Applicants.
. The training	No. spok	neltreti	Versus			6
	Union of	india &			• • • • • • • •	Respondents.
			WITH			
corretion made as per coder prosed in mp No 93 to day. RAN-	Original	Applica	tion No:	461		
cogn freshy in wb 40 33	1/92	L U K. k	iatre M	\	<i></i>	Applicants.
ti-day. Exm	113		Versus	_		•
31-5-93	Union of	India &	ethers			Respondents
91~ 17			WITH			1
	Original	Applica	tion No:	462	of 1992	
	O.P.Kush	uvaha			• • • • • • •	Applicants.
	•		Versus			
	Union of	India &	ethers		• • • • • • •	Respondents.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*		WITH			
	Original	Applicat	tion No:	463	of 1992	
	A.K.Sriva	astava				Applicants.
			Versus			
	Union of	India &	ethers			Respondents.
			WITH			•
	Original	Applicat	tion No:	464	of 1992	
	B.V.Galva					Applicants.
	, =		Versus			
	Union of	India &				Respondents.
			WITH		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, and portagnico.
	Original	Applicat		465	af 1992	· · · ·
	Smt. H.L.		1011 1101	400		Applicants.
	JIII O TIEL	VH-TTT	Versus		* * * * * * * * *	whhiteenes.
	11-46	Tadia 8				0
3	Union of	THUIS &			* * * * * * * * *	Respondents.
9	0-1-1	A	WITH	1.55	-6.4000	
	Original	• •	Teu Ne:	400		0 2:
W	Harish Ku	lmar	Versus			Applicants,
	Union of	India				<i>E</i> 2
	OUTBIL DI	THOIS &			26660000	Respondents.
			WITH			

Original	Application No;	467 of	1992	
S.K.Shukl	.2			Applicants.
E12 250.0	Versus	Desc		
Union of	India & others			Respondents.
Original	Application No:	468 of	1992	
Surendra	Kumar		• • • • • • •	Applicants.
1	Versus	3		
Union of	India & ethers		*******	Respondents.
	WITH			
Original	Application No:	469 of	1992	
0.8. Magha			• • • • • • •	Applicants.
	Versus	3		
Union of	India & ethers WITH		• • • • • • •	Respondents.
Onisinol		470 -6	1000	
A.B. Knanu	Application NO:	470 01		Appliants
n . D . Mistin	Versus		• • • • • • • •	Applicants.
Union of	India & others	•		Parameter
OUT BI	THEIR & SCHOOLS		******	Respondents.
Orininal	Application No:	471 ef	1002	
B.K.Bhati		411 01		Applicants.
D a K a D I I w C I	Versus		•••••	
Union of	India & others			Respondents.
0,1,2011 01	WITH		,	opendence:
Orioinal	Application No:	472 of		
B.R.Singt				Applicants.
	Versus	3		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Union of	India & others			Respondents.
	WITH			•
Original	Application No:	473	f 1992	
R.P.Gupta				Applicants.
	Versus	3		
Union of	India & others			Respondents.
	WITH			
Original	Application No:	474 of	1992	
R.K.Tewar	i		• • • • • • •	Applicants.
	Versus			

Respendents.

Union of India & others

Original Application No: 374 of 1992

T.KeMishra

Versus

Unian of India & ethers Respendents

Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C. Hon'ble Mr. K.Obayya. Member-A

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice, U.C.Srivastava, V.C.)

Shri C.P.Srivastava has put in appearance in this case and has prayed for disposal of the case. The learned counsel for the respondents Shri P.Mathur prays for time to file Counter Affidavit. It is not necessary to grant time for the same as similar matter has been disposed of by the Bombay Bench and as well as Allahabad Bench. Therefore, the prayer of the learned counsel for the respondents is refused and the case is being decided by hearing the counsels for the parties.

2. In this case, after hearing, we are of the opinion that, the judgement which is delivered at Bombay and which has been followed here at Allahabad will hold good. The applicant appeared in a written test of Office Clerk in response to an advertisement issued by the Railway Service Commission, Bombay. The examination took place at various centres, the applicant was declared successful in the written test and called for interview. The applicant was declared successful in the selection for the post of Office Clerk. Commission
The Railway service Bombay informed the applicant that his name has been sent to the Central Railways for appointment as Office Clerk. After waiting for a considerable period when the applicant did not get appointment, the applicant

W

3.

approached the authorities and was told that certain enquiries in the irregularities which ok place are going on and he should wait for some time more. Lateron, a fresh list was published on 21.12.1986 in the Indian Express — and the name — of the applicant did not figure in the list. He represented against the same, but after failing to get any response a legal notice was sent and therester this application was filed before this Tribunal with a prayer that the respondents may be directed to offer appointment to him on the post of Office Clerk or upon any other equivallent post on the basis of his result as declared by the Railway service commission.

In the written statement filed by the

respondents it has been stated that the cause of

action arose and examination was conducted by the Railway Recruitment Board. Bombay and as such in no administration. case the present petition is cognizable by the/ In the vigilance enquiry certain tempering were found with the result the applicant's name was dropped and to that's why, he was not given appointment. In case, his appointment would have been given, a communication would have been made. Undoubtedly, maximus has because the person/passed the examination, he or she, as the case may be, and the result declared then the applicant should not have been dropped without any valid reason. If there was some foul play in the inclusion of his name, obviously, the applicant was to be given an opportunity or he should have been apprised of the necessary facts to enable him to submit reply and meet anything which was against him. But on the basis of the Vigilance Enquiry.

the applicant should not have been deprived from the appointment in which he became entitled against one of the vacancies which was advertised. person should be deprived of his rights which accrued or which necessarily will accrue an account of the foul play by the authorities unless he is not guilty or he was not given an opportunity of hearing. Accordingly, the application is allowed I and the respondents are directed to held an enquiry into the matter associating the applicant with the same and in case no foul play on his partisafound the applicant should not have been deprived of his appointment because someone has been found guilty. The enquiry should be completed within three months from the date of communication of this order. In case, the entire examination has been cancelled and none of those who appeared in the examination got the appointment then the applicant will have no case of his appointment. But in case, some appointments have been made and every case has to be decided on merits as indicated above, the enquir about the applicant's case may be made within three months from the date of communication of this order. Inscase, some of the persons are required to appear in Viva-Voce test and their written examination is accepted, but has not been cancelled they may appear in the Viva-Voce examination. This is a part of the selection itself and incase they succeed their result may be declared and they may be given appointment accordingly. The application stands disposed with these directions. No order as to costs.

Copy of the judgement shall be placed on every file.

Allahabad Dated: 9.2.1993

(JW)