

(R.A. No.060/00004/2016 &
M.A. No. 060/00108/2016 in
O.A. No. 060/01080/2014)

9

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

R.A. No. 060/00004/2016 and M.A. No. 060/00108/2016 in O.A.
No. 060/01080/2014

Dated: Chandigarh, this the 25th day of January, 2016

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SMT. RAJWANT SANDHU, MEMBER(A)

SANJAY KUMAR

...APPLICANT

BY ADVOCATE: SHRI G.S. SATHI.

VERSUS

PGIMER, CHANDIGARH & ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

ORDER (in circulation)
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL, MEMBER(J):-

M.A. NO. 060/00108/2016 is allowed and delay of 25 days in
filing the R.A. is condoned.

2. Original Applicant Sanjay Kumar has filed this R.A. seeking review of our order dated 19.11.2015 whereby the O.A. No. 060/01080/2014 filed by him has been dismissed.

3. We have carefully considered the matter and perused the review application and the file of the O.A.

4. The applicant has alleged that there is no I.T.I. Certificate/Training for the trade of Caneman, and therefore, he was not ineligible for the post of Technician Grade-IV (Caneman). The contention is untenable because this fact has been noticed in the

(R.A. No.060/00004/2016 &
M.A. N o. 060/00108/2016 in
O.A. No. 060/01080/2014)

3

impugned order dated 19.11.2015 itself that there is no I.T.I. Certificate/Training for the trade of Caneman.

5. The applicant was held ineligible because he did not hold any trade certificate from recognized Institute, Board or Authority. He has now alleged that he holds Advanced Diploma in Software Applications & Data Processing from PGI-NICT Computer Centre (a Branch of National Institute of Computer Technology) and has also completed one year course of Computer System Maintenance from Royal Institute of Electronic Engineering, Chandigarh. However, no such plea was taken in the O.A. Moreover, there is no material on record to depict that these certificates possessed by the applicant are from recognized Institute, Board or Authority. Moreover, these are not Trade certificates, as is the requirement. Consequently, these certificates do not make the applicant eligible for the post in question in view of the qualifications prescribed for the post as noticed in the impugned order. This plea also does not within purview of review jurisdiction. Under the garb of review, the whole O.A. is sought to be reopened and reargued. There is also no plea in the O.A. that any such certificates were annexed with application for the post made to the respondents or with the representation made to the respondents.

6. Resultantly, we find no merit in the instant R.A. which is, therefore, dismissed by circulation.

**(JUSTICE L.N. MITTAL)
MEMBER (J)**

**(RAJWANT SANDHU)
MEMBER(A)**

Dated: 25.01.2016
'SK'