

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH
CHANDIGARH**

O.A. NO.060/00067/2014

Decided on: 24.01.2014

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A)**

Mrs. Sunita Verma wife of Shri Jagtinder Kumar Verma, aged about 39 years, working as Instructor (Hindi Language) in Stenography Hindi on contract basis at Government Industrial Training Institute for Women, Sector 11, Chandigarh resident of House No.1411, Sector 20-B, Chandigarh.

....Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary to Government, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Technical Education, New Delhi.
2. Director General Employment and Training, Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, Shram Shakti Bhavan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi.
3. Union Territory, Chandigarh through its Secretary, Technical Education, U.T. cum Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration, UT Civil Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh.
4. Director, Technical Education, U.T. cum Joint Secretary Finance, UT Civil Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh.
5. Principal, Government I.T.I. for women, Sector 11, Chandigarh.

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Amar Vivek, counsel for the applicant

Mr. Deepak Agnihotri, counsel for the respondents No. 1 & 2
Mr. Aseem Rai, counsel for Respondents No. 3,4 & 5

Order (Oral)

BY HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER(J)

1. By way of the present O.A., the applicant has sought mainly the following reliefs:-

(i) To direct the concerned respondents to remove the sheer misprint in non-inclusion of Hindi Stenographic course and to incorporate and amend the syllabus for Hindi Stenography in line with the revised syllabus (Annexure A-4) sent by DGET, Government of India to all Industrial Training Institutes vide letter No. DGET-2/3/2013-CD dated 18.02.2013 and norms issued later on 23.09.2013, and norms now issued by DGET.

(ii) To direct the respondents to add the post of Language Instructor (Hindi) i.e. Anudeshak Bhasa, as per the norms issued by DGET and as per 'Accreditation Criteria for Government and Private Industrial Training Institute available at the as the said accreditation has been done by the 'Quality Council of India' in consultation with NCVT.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant was appointed to the post of Instructor, Hindi Language (Stenography) on contract basis against a sanctioned post since 2007 in Industrial Training Institute, Sector 11, Chandigarh and is continuing as such, by

virtue of an interim order passed by this Tribunal in O.A. NO.250/CH/2013. He submits that by sheer misprint and inadvertent omission, the revised syllabus did not contain Cognate (Hindi Language) syllabus. He represented to the respondents in this regard whereupon the syllabus was partially revised in the first semester but not in the second semester. Learned counsel submits that the applicant has made a representation dated 20.12.2013(Annexure A-9) to the Director Technical Education, Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh praying therein to review/amend the syllabus for Hindi Stenogrpahy/Language(Cognate) amended in 2013 on the pattern of old syllabus published in 2008 and to add the post of Language Instructor (Hindi) i.e. Anudeshak Bhasa as per the norms of DGET and Quality Council of India Guidelines and on the pattern of old syllabus published in 2008. That representation was considered and forwarded by the Director Technical Education, UT to the Secretary, Technical Education, Chandigarh Administration vide Annexure A-12, but no further action thereupon has been taken at their end. Learned counsel prays that the applicant would be content if a time-bound direction is given to the concerned respondents to consider and take a view on her representation.

3. In view of the limited prayer made on behalf of the applicant, there is no need to issue notice to the respondents and call

↑
↓

for their reply. However, Mr. Deepak Agnihotri, learned Sr. Standing counsel for the Union of India and Mr. Aseem Rai, learned Standing counsel for the UT Administration, who are having advance notice, appear on behalf of Respondents No. 1& 2, and 3,4 & 5 respectively. They do not object to the disposal of the case in the requested manner.

4. Accordingly, the O.A. stands disposed of, on consensual basis, with a direction to the Competent Authority amongst the respondents to consider and take a final view on the representation of the applicant in accordance with law within a period of two months.

5. Needless to say, we have not commented upon the merits of the case.

6. No costs.

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)**

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)**

**PLACE: Chandigarh
Dated: 24.01.2014**

'mw'