

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore-560 038.

Dated: 2 AUG 1993

APPLICATION NO(s). 622 of 1993.

Applicant(s) Sri.Rajneesh Verma v/s. Respondent(s) Secretary,UPSC,  
New Delhi.

1. Sri.Rajneesh Verma,  
G-2, Incometax Colony,  
No.2, Infantry Road,  
Bangalore-560 001.
2. Sri.S.Ganesh Rao,  
Advocate, No.399,  
First Floor,65th Cross,  
5th Block,Rajajinagar,  
Bangalore-10.

SUBJECT:- Forwarding of copies of the Order passed by  
the Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore Bench  
Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/  
STAY/INTERIM ORDER passed by this Tribunal in the above said  
application(s) on ----- 19-07-93.

Revised

1m

of

*for* *Deputy Registrar*  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS DAY THE 19TH OF JULY, 1993

Present: Hon'ble Justice Mr.P.K.Shyamsundar Vice-Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr.V. Ramakrishnan Member(A)

APPLICATION NO.622/93

Shri Rajneesh Verma,  
G-2, Incometax Colony,  
No.2, Infantry Road,  
Bangalore - 560 001

Applicant

( Shri S. Ganesh Rao - Advocate )

v.

The Secretary,  
Union Public Service Commission,  
New Delhi - 110011

Respondent

This application has come up today  
before this Tribunal for orders. Hon'ble  
Justice Mr.P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice Chairman made  
the following:

ORDER

Having heard Shri Ganesh Rao for the  
applicant in this application, we reject the  
same at the admission stage itself. The grievance  
of the applicant is that although he made good  
a shortfall in payment of requisite fee for  
entertainment of his application for writing a  
competitive examination viz. All India Engineering



Services Examination, the shortfall being Rs.20/- in the payment of requisite fee, the UPSC had rejected his application. He urged that the rejection is bad because the shortfall of Rs.20/- was made by the applicant later on. Even so, we are not in a position to help the applicant. The application made by him for taking the examination was admittedly short by Rs.20/- vis-a-vis prescribed application fee and there is no dispute about it. Applicant's contention is that in the previous year the fee was Rs.80/- only and therefore he believed that this year also the fee would be Rs.80/- although the notified fee was Rs.100/-. Instead of depositing Rs.100/-, he deposited Rs.80/- but upon being told of the shortfall, he made good of the deficit etc. etc. There is a clear notification stating the prescribed fee is Rs.100/-. In this case admittedly the fee paid was Rs.80/-. If that was done with the knowledge that requisite fee was Rs.80/-, the applicant has himself to blame. He cannot blame the UPSC for rejecting his application for non-payment of requisite fee. The position is now that the application is rejected and, therefore, at the moment the applicant has not the requisite eligibility for appearing at the examination but still wants us to give him a chance to appear in the examination subject to the result of the examination made dependent on the outcome in this application.

2. We are afraid we cannot do that. As pointed out earlier there is no application on behalf

of the applicant for appearing in the examination. In the circumstances, it will be wrong and illegal on our part to permit the applicant to appear for the examination. We notice the applicant acted in too much haste in not submitting a proper application with the prescribed fee of Rs.100/-. We think it is that kind of unwarranted haste that has landed him in such a situation. For the reasons mentioned above, this application fails and is rejected. No costs.

Sd-

Sd-

MEMBER (A)

VICE CHAIRMAN

TRUE COPY



SECTION OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE

*[Handwritten signature]*  
21/8/93