CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH,
ALLAHABAD.

Dated: Allahabad, the 1st day of February, 2001

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.
Hon'ble Mr. Rafiq Uddin, J.M.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION Nos. 679 & 680 OF 2000

1. Swayam Prakash Verma,
s/o Sri Aman Lal Verma,
r/o LIG 50, Katju Rag Colony,
Salori, Allahabad.

2. Kapinjal Babu,
s/o Sri Jageshwar Prasad,
r/o vill. Jankipur,
Post Chalauli,
(Chail) Kaushambi.

. . . . . Applicants

(By Advocate Sri Saumitra Singh)

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Chairman,
Staff Selection Commission,
12, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi.

2. Regional Director, Central Region,
Staff Selection Commission,
8, Beli Road,
Allahabad.

3. Additional Secretary (Confidential),
Staff Selection Commission,
12, C.G.O. Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi.

. . . . . Respondents

(By Advocate Sri P. Mathur)

O R D E R (OPEN COURT)

(By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, AM)

These two OAs, having the same facts and grounds, have been filed by the applicants, who claim to belong to the category of S.C. These OAs have been heard together and are being decided by a common order. These applications have been filed for directing the respondents to declare the applicants as selected in the written examination held on 13.6.96 for the post of Inspector, Central Excise/ Income Tax etc. in the year 1996. A direction is also

Contd..2

sought to the respondents to issue a call letter in favour of the applicants calling them to appear in the interview for the said examination. Thereafter, the applicants pray that the result of the examination be declared, and if applicants are selected, they may be given appointments.

2. Twin grounds were made. Firstly, a prayer was made that the applicants had done very well and were sure to have obtained marks between 80 to 90%, which was re-affirmed by the teachers in the coaching classes. The second ground taken by the applicants is that the respondents have not determined the number of vacancies so far and, therefore, the number of candidates called for interview has no rational basis.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the applicants Sri Saumitra Singh and Sri Prashant Mathur, learned counsel for the respondents. We have also perused the original records brought by a representative of the Respondent no.1 placed before us by the learned counsel for the Respondents.

4. We find from the record that the cut off point for SC category was much above the marks secured by the applicants, who belong to the SC category.

5. As regards the issue of the number of candidates called, it has been contended by the learned counsel for the respondents that the candidates are called either on the basis of vacancies reported or on the average of previous years, subject to fixation of minimum ~~below~~ marks, below which the Commission would not like to go. We find no defect in this system calling candidates for interview after declaring them successful in the written examination. We, therefore, reject the OAs as lacking in merits.

No order as to costs.

J.M. A.M.

Nath/