

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**OA-119/2018
MA-112/2018**

New Delhi this the 08th day of February, 2018

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PERMOD KOHLI, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, MEMBER (A)**

1. Sundar Lal aged about 31 years,
s/o Sh. Hori Lal,
R/o M-1018, Bijuri Colliery,
District Anuppur,
Madhya Pradesh-484440.
2. Himanshu Singh aged about 26 years,
s/o Sh. Jitendra Bahadur Singh,
R/o 63, Muhalla Khurrampur,
Near Durga Mandir Post Sadar,
Gorakhpur, UP-273001. ... Applicants

(through Ms. Ananya De for Sh. Anuj Chauhan)

Versus

1. Prasar Bharati,
Through CEO, Mandi House,
New Delhi.
2. Director General (All India Radio),
Section S-IV (A),
Akashvani Bhawan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-110001. ... Respondents

(through Sh. S.M. Arif)

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman

Amended memo of parties has been filed which is taken on record.

MA No. 112/2018 filed for joining together is allowed.

OA No. 119/2018

The respondents issued an advertisement for Combined Recruitment to the post of Engineering Assistant and Technician in Prasar Bharati on 23.02.2013. The applicants applied for the post of Engineering Assistant. Staff Selection Commission (SSC) conducted combined examination for recruitment to both the posts. The applicants have been selected for the post of Technician. It is stated that the result demonstrates that persons with lesser marks have been appointed to the post of Engineering Assistant. Some of the similarly situated persons filed OA No. 2061/2014 and OA No. 2785/2014 before this Tribunal. The said OAs were disposed of vide order dated 03.11.2015 directing the respondents to consider the applicants for the post of Engineering Assistant. The applicants herein also made representation dated 17.08.2017 and 31.08.2017 respectively, seeking similar treatment. These representations have not been considered by the respondents. One of the prayers made in this OA is for a direction to the respondents to consider the representation/claim of the applicants.

2. In view of the above, this OA is disposed of with a direction to the respondent no. 2 to consider the representation/claim of the applicants in the light of the judgments referred to above within two

months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It has been brought to our notice that the applicant no. 1 is a resident of Madhya Pradesh and is presently posted at Rajgarh and applicant no. 2 is a resident of Uttar Pradesh and presently posted at Patna. Since relief claimed is for direction to dispose of the representation, we are showing indulgence. However, it is made clear that if in future, the applicants have to seek remedy, they will approach the jurisdictional Tribunal and this will not become a precedent in other matters.

(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE PERMOD KOHLI)
CHAIRMAN

/ns/