CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH, CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 897 OF 2012
CUTTACK, THIS THE 7TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2012

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.K. PATNAIK, MEMBER (JUDL.)

.....

Ajay Kumar Barik,
Aged about 23 years,
Son of Niranjan Barik,
Permanent resident of
At - Gopinathpur, (Hata Bazar),
P.O..- Jatni, P.S.-Delang,
Dist.- Puri

.....Applicant

Advocate(s) ..... M/s. R.K.Samantsinghar,
S.K.Ray, D.Paikray

VERSUS

Union of India represented through

1. The General Manager,
East Coast Railway,
Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar, Dist.-Khurda, Odisha.

2. Deputy Chief Personnel Officer (Recruitment)
Railway Recruitment Cell,
2nd Floor, E.Co.Railway Sadan,
Samanta Vihar, P.O.Mancheswar,
Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar, Dist.-Khurda.

3. The Asst. Personnel Officer (Recruitment)
Railway Recruitment Cell,
2nd Floor, E.Co.Railway Sadan,
Samanta Vihar, P.O.Mancheswar,
Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar, Dist.-Khurda.

..... Respondents

Advocate(s)..... Mr. T.Rath.

O R D E R (ORAL)

MR. A.K.PATNAIK, MEMBER (JUDL.):

Heard Mr. R.K.Samantsinghar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mr. T.Rath, Ld. Standing Counsel appearing for the Railways, on whom a copy of this O.A. has already been served.

2. The applicant has filed this O.A. solely on the ground that in the notification dated 17.12.2010 it has been stipulated that "Selection will consist of Physical Efficiency Test (PET) and Written Examination. Only those who found fit in the PET will have to appear for a Written Examination". However, his grievance is that instead of conducting the PET first, written test was conducted and the applicant was called to appear in the examination. Secondly, his grievance is regarding mal-arrangement of the running event and inadequate facility at Kalinga Stadium, Bhubaneswar, the venue for PET. He alleged that 40 candidates were put to stand within the area of 20 feet breadth to run. However, he has already participated in the selection process and the selection process is also continuing allowing the other candidates to participate in the selection.

3. Although, Ld. Counsel for the applicant insists to stay the selection, I am not inclined to stay the selection procedure.

4. Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that ventilating his grievance, the applicant has also filed representation vide Annexure-A/4 dated 29.10.2012 before Respondent No.2, i.e. Deputy Chief Personal Officer (Recruitment), E.Co.Railway, which is still pending. Mr. Rath, Ld. Standing Counsel for the Railways, is not aware whether the said representation has been disposed of by the authorities or not.

5. Having heard Ld. Counsel for the parties, without entering into the merit of the case, I direct Respondent No. 2 to consider the representation and pass a reasoned order within 6 weeks from today, if the same has not yet been disposed of. However, the applicant is at liberty to approach this Tribunal if he is not satisfied or his grievance is not adjudicated by way of proper, reasoned and speaking order.

6. With the above observation and direction, the O.A. stands disposed of.

7. Mr. Samantsinghar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, prays to serve copy of this order, along with paper book, to Respondent No. 2 by "Dasti". Prayer is allowed.

(A.K. PATNAIK)
MEMBER(JUDL.)

RK