

Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

O.A. No. 230/90.

Date of Decision : 3-8-90.

T.A.No.

_____	Petitioner.
_____	Advocate for the petitioner (s)
Versus	
_____	Respondent.
_____	Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. B.N.JAYASIMHA : VICE-CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE MR. D.SURYA RAO : MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? ☒
2. To be referred to the Reporter 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)


(BNJ)
VC


(DSR)
M(J)

2

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD
BENCH : AT HYDERABAD :

D.A.No.230/90.

Date of Judgment:03-08-1990.

S.Bal Reddy

...Applicant

Vs.

1. General Manager, Ordnance Factory
Project, Ministry of Defence,
Government of India, P.O.Yeddu
Mailaram District, Medak (A.P.)-502 205.
2. Employment Exchange Officer,
Medak District at Sanga Reddy.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri M.Raja Malla Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri Naram Bhaskar Rao,
Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI B.N.JAYASIMHA : VICE-CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI D.SURYA RAO : MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

(Judgment of the Division Bench delivered by
Hon'ble Shri D.Surya Rao, Member (J)).

The applicant herein had applied for the post
of Moulder in the respondents organisation. His name
was sponsored by the Respondent No.2 (Employment Exchange
Officer) to the respondent No.1 and he was called for an
interview by a letter dt.19-7-1989. Applicant did not
appear for the interview as he received the letter after
the date of interview. He alleges that the respondent No.1

B

contd..2.

- 2 -

again ^R

asked the 2nd respondent to sponsor names of persons for filling up the post of Moulder and fixed the interview date as the end of the January, 1990. Applicant alleges that his name was not sponsored by the 2nd respondent to the first respondent. On enquiry he came to know that as the ^{2nd R} 1st respondent ^{was R} asked to sponsor only those candidates with S.S.C. Certificates, National Trade Certificate in 'Moulder' and 'National Apprenticeship Certificate in Moulder'. His name was not sponsored by the 2nd respondent as he does not possess the S.S.C. certificate. He states that S.S.C. Certificate is not required under the rules and regulations of the 1st respondent. He further states that having sent ^{an R} interview letter to the applicant in the year 1989, he cannot be now deprived the opportunity of being interviewed for the post of Moulder.

2. On behalf of the respondent No.1 a counter has been filed stating that originally ^{the post} / was notified to the Employment Exchange on 11-3-89 prescribing the educational qualifications as VIII class with an ITI in the trade of Moulder with National Apprenticeship Certificate. The applicant did not appeared for the interview despite notice. It is stated in the counter that the job ^{requirement R} was revised and the revised job qualifications ^{provide} ~~are~~ that the minimum education qualification should be Matriculation or equivalent and ITI in the trade of Moulder plus National

contd.....3..

- 3 -

Apprenticeship Certificate. In view of the revised job specifications, a fresh requisition was placed before the 2nd respondent and 27 candidates were sponsored by the Employment Exchange Officer. The name of the applicant was not available in the second list, because he did not fulfill the job requirements prescribed. Since the name of the applicant was not available in the second list of candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange, he was not called for interview by the 1st respondent. It is further stated that the statement made by the applicant that the S.S.C. qualification is not required for recruitment to the post of Moulder is not correct. For these reasons respondents oppose the application.

3. We have heard Shri Agamaiah, Advocate for Shri M. Rajamallappa Reddy, counsel for the applicant and Shri Naram Bhaskar Rao, learned standing counsel for the Central Government for the respondent No.1. It is clear from the facts stated in the counter that the qualifications for the post of Moulder have since been revised. In view of the revised job specifications ~~and that~~ the applicant does not possess the qualifications. In the circumstances, there is no merit in the application. Application is dismissed. No order as to costs.

B.N. Jayasimha
(B.N. JAYASIMHA)
Vice-Chairman

D. Surya Rao
(D. SURYA RAO)
Member (J)

Dated : 3rd August, 1990.
Dictated in Open Court.

avl/

Dr. S. Kumar Reddy
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JUDL)