

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
LUCKNOW BENCH  
LUCKNOW

....

Original Application No. 471 of 1991 (L)

this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 1994

HON'BLE MR. V.K. SETH, ADMN. MEMBER  
HON'BLE MR. D.C. VERMA, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Mahojj Kumar, aged about 21 years S/o Late Shri Phool  
Chand, R/o 555/52-3 Ka Kanausi, Manak Nagar, Lucknow.

Applicant

By Advocate : None

Versus

Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of  
Information & Broadcasting, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Director, Public Relation (Administration) Press  
Information Bureau, Headquarter, Shastri Bhawan,  
New Delhi/Chairman-Selection Board.

3. Administrative Officer, Press Information Bureau,  
Government of India, 12-Prem Nagar, Ashok Marg, Lucknow.

4. Officer-In-Charge, Press Information Bureau, 12-  
Prem Nagar, Ashok Marg, Lucknow, U.P.

Respondents

By Advocate : None

ORDER

V.K. SETH, MEMBER (A)

In this O.A. the applicant has prayed for issue  
of directions to the respondents to consider his case  
for appointment on the post of Motor Cycle Driver for  
which interview was taken on 25.9.91 at Lucknow.

2. The applicant has been working in the Press  
Information Bureau, Lucknow from 2.5.1990 as Peon/

Messenger on daily wages. On 24.9.1991 ~~he~~ was informed by the Administrative Officer (respondent No. 3) that his name has been forwarded by the Employment Exchange in connection with the filling-up of the post of Motor Cycle Driver and he was asked to appear <sup>for</sup> <sup>to be</sup> interview/held on 25.9.1991 for the purpose and he was also asked to bring all the relevant documents in connection with Education, Driving Licence etc. in original at the time of interview. For the said interview the Employment Exchange had forwarded only two names and <sup>the</sup> other candidates did not appear before the interview board leaving at the applicant who alone appeared <sup>the</sup> interview. ~~xxxx~~

~~and~~ The result of this interview/selection was not declared. Subsequently, on 25.10.1991 another interview was held at Kanpur in which the applicant was neither included nor called for interview.

3. The applicant's contention is that he is fully qualified and experienced for the post of Motor Cycle Driver. He alleges violation of principle of natural justice in not <sup>being</sup> given appointment ~~xxxx~~. In his Rejoinder affidavit he states that the condition of 4 years experience as Motor Cycle Driver is relaxable under the Recruitment Rules in case of Scheduled Caste candidate as also was mentioned in the requisition form sent to the Employment Exchange.

4. Counter and Rejoinder affidavits were exchanged in the case. However, counsel for the parties were not present on 19.9.1994 when the case was listed for hearing. We are, therefore, deciding the case on the basis of

pleadings on record which have been carefully considered by us.

5. The respondents have categorically stated that the applicant was not found eligible and no candidate was selected in the interview held on 25.9.1991. They also state that only selected candidates are informed as per practice and, therefore, the applicant was not informed. We do not find any thing violative of the principles of natural justice in this action of the respondents. The applicant could have approached the respondents for ascertaining whether he was selected in interview held on 25.9.1991 which apparently he failed to do. The applicant has also not filed any material to show that the condition of 4 years Driving experience was relaxable in the case of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe candidates. As regards his not being called for the second interview for the same post held on 25.10.91 at Kanpur, the respondents' action cannot be faulted, as the applicant had already been found in-eligible at the time of earlier interview in Lucknow. More-over the second interview was held for the post of Motor Cycle Driver at the Bureau Office, at Kanpur and only those candidates ~~who~~ were sponsored by the Employment Exchange, Kanpur to be considered.

6. In view of the foregoing discussions the O.A. lacks merit and is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

  
MEMBER (J)

LUCKNOW: DATED: 26-9-94

GIRISH/

  
MEMBER (A)

26-9-94