

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

69

O.A. No. 182/90

Dt. of Decision 16.6.93

T.A. NO.

B. Srinivasulu

Petitioner

Mr. C.V. Narayana Reddy

Advocate for  
the petitioner  
(s)

Versus

SHAR Centre, Sriharikota, Nellore, A.P.,  
Redp. by its Director.

Respondent.

Mr. N.V. Ramana

Advocate for  
the Respondent  
(s)

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. A.B. GORTHI : MEMBER (ADMN.)

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY : MEMBER (JUDL.)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement? *y*
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? *y*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *✓*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? *y*
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.)

ns

*T. C. M.*  
(HTCSR)  
M(J)

*2*  
(HABG)  
M(A)

(65)

.. 2 ..

Order of the Division Bench delivered by  
Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (Admn.).

---

The applicant who was selected for appointment as Lab Attendant A under the Department of Space, Indian Space Research Organisation, SHAR Centre is aggrieved by the respondents' failure to appoint him as Lab Attendant 'A'. The prayer of the applicant is for a direction to the respondents to appoint him as Lab Attendant A on the basis of the documents furnished by him and on the result of the selection held. The applicant's contention is that although he fulfilled all the requisite qualifications and possessed the specified experience, he was not given the appointment order despite the fact that he was duly selected and was even subjected to medical examination.

2. The respondents in <sup>his</sup> their reply affidavit have stated that the applicant was duly considered for appointment as Lab Attendant 'A' <sup>and</sup> was selected along with another candidate. The said selection was provisional and as per procedure the selected candidates were subjected to medical examination. However, before the minutes of the selection committee could be duly approved by the appointing authority, it came to the notice of the concerned officials that the applicant had furnished wrong information in his application. As per the recruitment rules a candidate who had attended an interview for a similar post within <sup>previous</sup> the ~~provision~~ of one year in the Centre or any of the ISRO

..3

2

20/10/19

Copy to:-

- 10 —

Rsm/-

3. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if the matrix  $A$  is stable. The second part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if the matrix  $A$  is not stable. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are unbounded and tend to infinity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if the matrix  $A$  is not stable.

SUNDAY

70

Centres is not eligible to be called for interview again within one year. The applicant <sup>had earlier</sup> ~~who~~ appeared for an interview for the post of Helper 'A' on 24.9.1987 in the Centre but was not selected. The applicant in his application had suppressed this information by stating that he had not appeared for any interview in the Centre. The officials concerned further detected that the certificate produced by the applicant in support of his having gained experience by working in Marks Fine Chemicals Private Limited from 2.12.1984 to 21.1.1988 was also not factually accurate. When these irregularities came to light, the respondents took the decision not to appoint the applicant as his appointment under the circumstances would be not in conformity <sup>with</sup> ~~in~~ the relevant recruitment rules.

3. This case was listed for hearing on 29.4.1993, but none appeared for <sup>the</sup> applicant. It was accordingly listed for dismissal on 16.6.1993. Even today neither the applicant nor his counsel is present to press the application. Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.N.V.Ramana, Standing Counsel for the respondents <sup>and</sup> present / we have <sup>therefore</sup> gone through the entire record.

4. In view of the facts as afore-stated, it is apparent that the respondents rightly refused to appoint the applicant as Lab Attendant 'A'. The application is thus without merit and it is hereby dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)  
Member (Judl.)

(A.B.GORTHY)  
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 16th June, 1993

(Dictated in Open Court )

By Registrar (Judl.)

IN

C

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO  
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTY : MEMBER (AD)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY  
MEMBER (J)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. P. T. TIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated : 16/6/1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

~~M.A. / R.A. / C.A. No.~~

O.A. No.

in

182/90 ✓

T.A. No.

(w.p.)

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed ✓

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/ Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

Central Administrative Tribunal  
HYDERABAD BENCH

28 JUN 1993

RECEIVED  
TAPPAL SECTION

18/6/93