

Rejoinder not filed
by order.

19.1.2000 Bench

Rejoinder not
filed
by further order

17.2.2000 Bench

For hearing.

18.5.2000 Bench

For hearing.

Bench.

12. Order Dated 19.05.2000

Court work suspended due to sad
death of a member of the Bar.
Adj. to ~~2005~~ ^{thu} 23.05.2000.

Vice-Chairman
19/5

Member (J),

13. Order dated 23.5.2000

Learned counsel for the applicant Shri S. Palit is not present when called nor any request has there been made on his behalf seeking adjournment. We have therefore, heard Shri R.C.Rath, learned Addl. Standing Counsel and also perused the records.

In this case the applicant has prayed for a direction to respondents to accept his application directly even though he has not registered his name in the employment exchange.

The case of the applicant is that recruitment to the post of Gangman and other Group D posts in Operative Department of the Divisional Railway Manager issued employment notice dated 5.11.1998 in which it is mentioned that applications from eligible candidates will be accepted only through employment exchange. Applicant has stated that as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court consideration for appointment to public post cannot be confined only to persons sponsored by the employment exchange and therefore, he has prayed that his application sent directly should be considered.

Respondents in their counter have stated that subsequent to issuing of notice dated 5.11.1998 a subsequent notice was issued on 26.11.1998 which is at Annexure-R/1 stating that those candidates who will apply directly in response to employment notice will also be considered along with those sponsored through employment exchange. In view of this it is clear that the applicant's prayer that his case should be considered

J.Som.

Orderdaff. 23.5.2022

Copy of order
may be given to
both the counsels.

B
26.5.2022

Recd
26.5.2022
S. (S)

by the respondents for the vacancy notified even though his name has not been sponsored by the employment exchange and has applied directly has been allowed by the respondents, who have stated that the cases of those who have applied without coming through the employment exchange will also be considered.

In view of the above we find that this O.A. has become infructuous as the prayer of the applicant has already been met by the respondents. The O.A. is therefore, disposed of as infructuous, but no order as to costs.

23.5.2022
VICE CHAIRMAN

J. M. MEMBER (JUDICIAL)