

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

OA No.567/2001

Dated Tuesday this the 18th day of November, 2003.

C O R A M

HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR.H.P.DAS, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. K.Babu Rajan Nair  
S/o Shri R.Krishna Pillai  
Ballast Train Checker (BTC)  
Assistant Divisional Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Quilon.
2. K.N.Praseed Kumar  
Senior Trackman  
S/o Shri P.A.Narayanan Nair  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Kottayam.
3. M.D.Varkey  
Senior Trackman  
S/o Shri Mathayi Devasya  
Senior Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Chalakkudi.
4. K.M.Nazarudeen  
Senior Trackman  
S/o Shri N.K.Muhammad  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Ernakulam.
5. A.V.Jacob  
Senior Trackman  
S/o Shri A.C.Varghese  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Aluva.
6. E.K.Dinesan  
Senior Trackman  
S/o Shri K.Kesavan  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Aluva.

Applicants.

(By advocate Mr.George Varghese Perumpallikuttyil)

Versus

1. Union of India  
Represented by General Manager  
Southern Railway  
Park Town, Chennai.

2. Chief Personnel Officer  
Southern Railway  
Chennai.
3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer  
Divisional Office  
Personnel Branch  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum.
4. Divisional, Engineer (North)  
Divisional Office  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum.
5. Ramesh Kambli  
Divisional Engineer (North)  
Divisional Office  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum.
6. P.S.Mohanan Thambi  
Senior Trackman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway, Trivandrum.
7. P.Somarajan  
Senior Trackman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway, Trivandrum.
8. M.Sasidharan Nair  
Senior Trackman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway, Trivandrum.
9. P.Krishnaraj  
Senior Storeman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway  
Nagarcoil.
10. B.Prabhakaran Nair  
Senior Trackman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway, Quilon.
11. G.Sasikumaran Nair  
Senior Trackman  
Section Engineer's Office  
Southern Railway, Quilon.
12. P.Parameswaran Pillai  
Ballast Train Checker  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum Central.
13. C.Sreekantan  
Adhoc Ballast Train Checker  
Southern Railway  
Trivandrum Central.

Respondents

(By advocate Mrs.Sumathi Dandapani for R1-5)  
(Mr.R.Pushpangathan Pillai for R10)

The application having been heard on 18th November, 2003, the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

First applicant is a Ballast Train Checker and applicants 2 to 6 are Senior Trackmen. They participated in a limited departmental competitive examination for filling up 25% of the vacancies of Supervisor/Permanent Way Mistries in the pay scale Rs.4500-7000 pursuant to A-1 notification dated 18.4.2000. A written test was held on 28.4.2001. As a result of the written test, only 8 persons, namely respondents 6 to 13 were called for viva voce by letter dated 13.6.2001 (Annexure A4). Finding that the applicants' names were not there in A-4 call letter, dissatisfied by the manner of selection, the applicants have filed this application seeking to set aside A-1 notification, declaring that the selection process of Superintendent/Permanent Way Mistries pursuant to A-1 is illegal and for a direction to respondents 1 to 3 to conduct selection to the post of Supervisor/Permanent Way Mistries in the Trivandrum Division of Southern Railway afresh on the basis of Railway Board orders in that regard. It is alleged in the application that the question papers for the written test were in English, that the applicants were not permitted to write in regional languages, that the stipulation regarding holding of viva voce contained in A-1 is against the clarifications given in A-6 P.B.C.No.40/99 and that the holding of the test contravening the Railway Board's circular and not allowing the applicants to write the examination in the regional languages having caused prejudice to the applicants, the impugned notification as also A-4 call letter are liable to be set aside. The applicants, therefore, have prayed that the respondents may be directed to re-do the selection in accordance with the rules and instructions on the subject.

2. The official respondents have filed reply statement seeking to justify the impugned notification as also the call letter A-4. They contend that the clarifications contained in A-6 applies to recruitment made by Railway Recruitment Board whereas the procedure for limited departmental competitive examination is as contained in paragraph 219 of the Indian Railway Establishment Manual. There is no prohibition in holding a viva voce to assess the suitability of the incumbent for promotion as per rules and, therefore, the challenge against the notification is without merit, contend the respondents. Regarding the use of regional language, the respondents contend that the applicants did not raise any grievance at the time of the examination and, therefore, it is idle for the applicants, at this stage, to raise any grievance.

3. It has been alleged in the application that the 5th respondent had shown favouritism to those who were closely associated with him and, therefore, the process of selection was vitiated by malafides.

4. The 5th respondent has filed an affidavit denying the allegation of malafides raised against him. It has also been made clear by the 5th respondent that the candidates had written their answer papers in their regional languages also and there is no substance in the allegation that they were not allowed to write in Malayalam.

5. On a careful scrutiny of the entire material placed on record and on hearing the learned counsel of the applicant as also of the respondents, we do not find any substance in the

✓

allegation made in the application and the challenge against A-1 & A-4. If the applicants had any grievance regarding the holding of a viva voce, A-1 notification should have been immediately challenged. Although the notification was issued on 27.6.2000 and the examination was held on 28.4.2001 and viva voce held on 13.6.01, the OA was filed on 4.7.01. The applicants willingly participated in the process of selection. Further no rule or instruction has been brought to our notice that in the process of selection under the departmental competitive examination, viva voce should not be held. A-6 does not relate to promotions made under the limited departmental competitive examination. It relates to direct recruitment by Railway Recruitment Board. Therefore, the challenge against A-1 has no substance. Regarding the claim of the applicants that they were not permitted to write the examination in regional language and this has caused prejudice to them, we find absolutely no substance in this argument in view of the fact that the 5th respondent in the reply statement clearly stated that the candidates were allowed to write the test in regional languages such as Malayalam, Tamil and Hindi and those papers had also been evaluated.

6. The applicant has not filed any rejoinder refuting this. Further, if the applicants had any grievance that they were not allowed to write the test in regional languages which caused prejudice to them, normally they would have immediately made a complaint to the higher authorities. They did not do so. The applicants, understanding that they did not come out successful

*[Handwritten signature/initials over the bottom left]*

*[Handwritten signature/initials over the bottom right]*

in the written test, have filed this application challenging the process of selection. Further the 5th respondent has in his reply statement clearly refuted the allegation of malafides. The allegation of malafides is also vague, bald and non specific.

7. In the light of what is stated above, we do not find any infirmity in the impugned orders nor do we find that the selection process has been vitiated for any reason.

8. In the result, the application which is devoid of merit, is dismissed. No costs.

Dated 18th November, 2003.

H. P. DAS  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

aa.



A.V. HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN