

(24)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH: AT HYDERABAD.

O. A. No. 406/89.

Date of Decision:

~~XXXXXX~~

Mohd. Khalid Ali Khan & another

Petitioner.

Shri Sheik Shah Ali (Not present)

Advocate for  
the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India, Rep. by its Director,

Door Darshan Kendra, Hyderabad & 3 others

Respondent.

Shri V. Rajeswara Rao for Shri N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC  
(for R1 to R3)

Advocate for  
the Respondent  
(s)


Shri D. Panduranga Reddy (for R4)

COR. M:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. Balasubramanian : Member(A)

THE HON'BLE MR. C.J. Roy : Member(J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. whether their lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?
5. Remarks of Vice Chairman on Columns 1,2,4 (To be submitted to Hon'ble Vice-Chairman where he is not on the Bench.)

  
HRBS  
M(A).

  
HCJR  
M(J).

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.406/89.

Date of Judgement 14-9-1992

1. Mohd. Khalid Ali Khan  
2. B.Gambheer .. Applicants

Vs.

- 1. Union of India,  
Rep. by its Director,  
Door Darshan Kendra,  
Hyderabad.
- 2. The Station Engineer,  
T.V.Maintenance Centre,  
Rajahmundry, East Godavari Dt.
- 3. The Asst. Engineer,  
Low Power, T.V.Maintenance Centre,  
Adilabad, Adilabad Dt.
- 4. The Dist. Employment Officer,  
Adilabad, Adilabad Dt. .. Respondents

---  
 Counsel for the Applicants : Shri. D.P. Kulkarni (Not present)  
 Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Rajeswara Rao for  
 Shri N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC  
 (for R1 to R3)  
 Shri D.Panduranga Reddy (for R4)

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian : Member(A)

Hon'ble Shri C.J.Roy : Member(J)

X Judgement as per Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian, Member(A) X

---  
 This application has been filed by Shri Mohd. Khalid Ali Khan & another against the Union of India, Rep. by its Director, Door Darshan Kendra, Hyderabad & 3 others under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking a direction to the Respondent No.2 to consider the case of the applicants for the post of Helper/Technician as per Notification No.2(4)89/A/2518 dt. 1.3.89 alongwith the candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange.

2. The applicants responded to the Notification dt. 1.3.89 referred to above for the post of Helper/Technician. The applicants are registered with the Employment Exchange and are

To

1. The Director, Union of India,  
Door Darshan Kendra, Hyderabad.
2. The Station Engineer,  
T.V.Maintenance Centre,  
Rajahmundry, East Godavari Dist.
3. The Assistant Engineer, Low Power,  
T.V.Maintenance Centre, Adilabad, Adilabad Dist.
4. The Dist. Employment Officer, Adilabad, Adilabad Dist.
5. One copy to Mr. D.P. Kali, Advocate for Mr. Sheik Shah Ali, Advocate  
3-2-763, Kachiguda, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC CAT. Hyd.
7. One copy to Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy, Spl Counsel for A.P. Govt. CAT. Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm.

awaiting call letters. It is their case that the respondents should have advertised the vacancies instead of filling them up through the Employment Exchange. When the applicants approached the respondents they were told that their names could be considered only if sponsored by the Employment Exchange. Hence this application.

3. The respondents have opposed the application and have filed a counter affidavit. It is contended by them that only candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange should be considered for the vacancies advertised and they relied on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in AIR 1987 SC 1227.

4. Finding inadequate response from the learned counsel for the applicants the case was posted for dismissal on 8.9.92. Still there was no representation from the applicants. Hence we heard only Shri V.Rajeswara Rao for the respondents and reserved the case for orders.

5. The point involved is very short whether the respondents can consider cases of candidates not sponsored by the Employment Exchange. This Bench had repeatedly held, based on several decisions including that of the Hon'ble Supreme Court [ JT 1992(1) SC 394 ] ~~upholding~~ that sponsorship through the Employment Exchange is essential for consideration of any candidate. That being the case, we have no hesitation in dismissing this application with no order as to costs.

R. Balasubramanian

( R. Balasubramanian )  
Member (A).

C. J. Roy

( C. J. Roy )  
Member (J).

12

Dated: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 1992.

Deputy Registrar (S)

202