

Date of Order	Order O.A.No.20/95.
	19.5.95. :: S :: ----- Mr.J.K.Kaushik- Counsel for the applicant. Miss Padmini Rathore- Brief holder for Mr. J.P.Joshi- Counsel for the respondents. Heard Shri J.K.Kaushik learned counsel for the applicant and Miss Rathore on behalf of the respondents. The case of the applicant is that he had secured less marks in certain papers at the examination held in 1992 for promotion to the rank of J.A.O. and he had applied for/copy of marksheet and for retotal in March, 1994. Consequent on this application, a reply was given to him that his marks are have been verified and they were correctly intimated. Again in December, 1994, the applicant made another representation to the Director General of Post saying that he apprehended certain irregularities in valuation of the marks and, therefore, he desired that his answer books may be revalued. Not getting a reply to this representation he has now come up with this application on 16.1.95, seeking a direction to the respondents to produce the answer books which are supposed to be having manipulations adverse to him. The learned counsel for the respondents has taken a preliminary objection that this O.A. is not maintainable as Supreme Court has ruled in a case ^{of} A.I.R.1984 S.C.page 1543, Maharastra State Board of Secondary & Higher Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Paritosh Bhupesh Kumar Shethi, that revaluation of an ...2.

C. A. T. Bench, JODHPUR

Date of Order	Order
	:: 2 :: answer book in any examination is not covered by the principles of natural justice and, therefore, has not case of reopening of such matters. I have heard the both the parties and found that the applicant has rushed to the Tribunal even before a reply to his representation has been received. There has been no disposal of the representation. Having filed a representation the applicant has to necessarily await an order thereon. It is only after the final order the matter is given by the competent authority, he would have a right to approach this court for any redressal of a civil injury or grievances, he may have against the respondents. The case is, therefore, dismissed as premature. (N.K. Varma) Member (Adm.) Part II and III destroyed in my presence on 26/11/2014 under the supervision of section officer as per order dated 4/9/2014 Section Officer (Record)

Received copy
20/5/14
R/copy
on 24/5/14