

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

Dt. 28.11.2003

On the prayer of
Ld. counsel for the
applicant, time is
granted till 24.12.03
to file rejoinder.

[Signature]
REGISTRAR

Counter by official receipts
(private receipt filed) —
copies served.

No steps for filing
rejoinder taken.

For hearing.

Baner

h
3/12/03

order dated 04.05.2005

Mr. U.B. Mohapatra, Ld. Sr. Standing Counsel
undertakes to file appearance in the matter
and pays for adjournment of the matter
by one day. Petitioner is allowed.

Call on 05.05.2005

[Signature]
Member

[Signature]
Chairman 4/5

Order dated : 5.5.05

None appears for the applicant nor
the applicant is present in person. However,
Mr. U.B. Mohapatra, Ld. Sr. Standing Counsel
and also Mr. P.K. Padhi, Ld. Counsel for the
Respondent No.4 were present.

2. The applicant by filing this O.A. has
alleged that although the post was advertised
and reserved for ST category, the Respondent
No.3 has selected Respondent No.4 who belongs
to OBC by showing undue favour.

3. The facts of the case are not in
dispute. However, the Respondents by filing
detailed counter and by submitting the check
list of the candidates who had applied for
the selection to the post in question has
disclosed that the applicant whose name
appears at Sl. No.28 of the 45 candidates
considered for selection to the post could
not be considered for final selection on
the ground that he did not fulfill all the
formalities in connection with selection,
i.e., he did not submit character certifi-
cate, along with the application form. The

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

Copy & return dt. 11/5/95
forwarded to the counsel

for both state.

11/5/95
S.O.

11/5/95

other ST candidate whose name appears at Sl. No.42 of the check list also ~~not~~ not considered as his application was received after due date.

4. In the circumstances, the selection was made out ^{of} to the OBC category candidates as per the procedure notified in the advertisement.

5. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, we see no irregularity in the selection for the post made by Respondent No.3, and accordingly, this O.A. is disposed of being devoid of merit.

MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

VICE-CHAIRMAN