CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated: 5 JAN 1995

APPLICATION NO: 1678 of 94

APPLICANTS:- C.K Ramesh, Bangalore.

V/S.

RESPONDENTS:- Controller General, Defence Accounts, New Delhi and Others

To

① Sri. R. Shasthchandra,
Advocate, No. 5/62,
Vishwabharathi Nilaya,
5th Cross, South Block,
Rajajinagar, Bangalore-10

② Sri. M. Vasudeva Rao,
Addl. C.G.S.C.,
High Court Bldg,
Bangalore-1

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

--xx--

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/ passed by this Tribunal in the above mentioned application(s) on 22nd Dec 94

Issued on
05/01/95

for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

gm*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

O.A. No.1678/94

THURSDAY THIS THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF DECEMBER 1994

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar ... Vice-Chairman

Shri T.V. Ramanan ... Member [A]

C.K. Ramesh,
S/o C.N. Krishna Shetty,
Aged about 21 years,
R/a No.7/12,
D.A.D. Complex,
Cambridge Road,
Ulsoor, Bangalore-8. ... Applicant

[By Advocate Shri R. Sharath Chandra]

1. The Controller General
of Defence Accounts,
R.K. Puram,
New Delhi.

2. The Controller of Defence Accounts [Ors], South,
Agaram Post,
Bangalore-560 007.

3. Sri Johnson, Major,
S/o Kuppan,
R/o DAD Complex,
No.7/6, Cambridge Road,
Ulsoor, Bangalore-560 008. ... Respondents

[By Advocate Shri M. Vasudeva Rao
Addl. Standing Counsel for Central Govt.]

O R D E R

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:

1. We have heard Shri Sharat Chandra, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents and find no substance in this application wherein the applicant who sought selection to a Group D post in the office of Controller of Defence Accounts, Bangalore has since been interviewed in that aspect. Although the applicant was interviewed under what appears to be a category called the Wards quota, Shri Sharat Chandra says

that the Wards quota is earmarked for the children of the guardians and parents who served or still serving in the Department and says that it is in that category that the claim of the applicant has to be considered and we notice that the claim has also been considered under the wards quota.

2. It transpires that in all recruitment was made for 10 vacancies and out of that 4 slots were reserved under the wards quota. As a result of the interview under the wards quota four persons who had secured the highest marks at the interview wee ultimately selected. We have perused the records maintained by the selection committee and are satisfied that there has been no deviation in the matter of selection which appears to be based purely on the marks obtained by each of the candidates at the interview. We state once again that the applicant had secured less marks than the four people who were selected. On this simple question of comparison of the applicant with those selected, this application has to fail. But then Shri Sharat Chandra maintains that under the wards quota the criteria for selection should be relatable to the seniority of the guardians and parents of the Wards. We asked him, what was the basis for the contention and whether the recruitment rules provided for it or whether the notification inviting applications contained such a stipulation. Counsel was unable to lay hands on any provision of the recruitment rules enjoining such a provision and what is more as we

have ourselves seen there is nothing in the notification inviting applications making any consession in that behalf about seniority and in that situation it is futile to contend that selection should be relatable to the seniority of the parents and guardians. There is absolutely no basis for such contention and it, therefore, fails.

3. As we are satisfied that the selection of the candidates was made purely on the basis of the performance at the interview where the applicant did not perform just well enough, therefore, it follows that this application is without any substance and is liable to be dismissed. It is ordered accordingly. No costs.

Sd-
MEMBER [A]

Sd-
VICE-CHAIRMAN

bsv

TRUE COPY

9/1/95

Section Officer
Central Administrative Tribunal
Bangalore Bench
Bangalore