

OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD.

Allahabad, this the 17th day of May 2002.

QUORUM : HON. MR. S. DAYAL, A.M.

HON. MR. RAFIQUDDIN, J.M.

O.A. No. 74 of 2000.

Virendra Kumar Shukla aged about 27 years s/o Sri Mahavir Prasad Shukla r/o 66 Tilak Nagar, Allahabad..... Applicant.

Counsel for applicant : Sri Shishir Kumar.

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Staff Selection Commission, Block No.12, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
2. Staff Selection Commission, Central Region through its Regional Director, 8A, Beli Road, Allahabad.

..... Respondents.

Counsel for respondents : Sri J.N. Sharma.

ORDER (ORAL)

BY HON. MR. S. DAYAL, A.M.

This application has been filed for setting aside the order dated 26.7.99 and direction to the respondents to issue an appointment letter to the applicant. The applicant had appeared for clerk grade examination held on 22.9.96 and qualified in the written examination. He had appeared in the typing test held subsequently and hoped that he would succeed and be empanneled. He was, however, issued a memorandum dated 28.3.98 in which it was alleged that the signature/photograph appeared to be of two different persons and charge have been levelled against the applicant that he empersonated in the written examination with typing test with malafide intention for securing employment.

2. The respondents in their counter reply have stated that the specimen handwriting and signature along with answer script of the applicant as well as his application form were sent to Govt. examiner of question document, Shimla to ascertain the veracity of the assertion of the applicant. The opinion of

11

: 2 :

the Govt. examiner of question document was explicit^{ly} that the applicant had been impersonated in written part of clerk grade examination. It is claimed that since the applicant had given an undertaking that in case his statement made in the application form were found incorrect, his candidature could be cancelled, [✓] The applicant is not entitled to the relief claimed by him in the O.A.

3. The assertions made in the counter reply remain uncontroverted. We, therefore, find no merit in the O.A., which is dismissed.

No order as to costs.

Darvinuddin

J.M.

A. M.

A. M.

Asthana/
23.5.02