

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.1275/2016**

New Delhi, this the 07<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman  
Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)**

Nitin Tanwar  
Aged 29 years,  
S/o Shri Manohar Lal  
R/o House No.6, Water Works No.1,  
Civil Line, Delhi-54. .... Applicant.

(By Advocate : Shri Yogesh Sharma)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Through its Chief Secretary  
Delhi Secretarial, near ITO,  
New Delhi.
2. The Secretary  
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,  
FC-18, Institutional Area, Karkardooma,  
Delhi-92. ... Respondents.

(By Advocate : Shri N. K. Singh for Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat)

**: O R D E R (ORAL) :**

**Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman :**

Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB) invited applications for various posts, like J.E. (Electrical), MCD/J.E. (Electrical), DAMB/J.E. (Electrical), NDMC/J.E. (Electrical), DTL/Manager (Electrical), DTC etc.

2. The applicant considering himself to be eligible, applied for the post code No.11/12, 13/12, 15/12, 68/13, 70/13 under OBC category. The competent authority conducted a common Tier-one examination on 31.05.2015 for the advertised posts. It is alleged that in the answer key published vide Notice dated 07.09.2015, the applicant found six wrong answers. The final answer key was also published vide Notice dated 04.12.2015. The applicant has mentioned at least three questions in

para 4.7 of the OA, which according to him, contain wrong answers. The applicant has secured 69 marks whereas the cut-off mark for OBC category, to which the applicant belongs, is 70. It is accordingly stated that if the applicant is awarded one mark in respect of the question for which the answer key was wrong, he is sure to succeed. In this regard, the applicant has made representations dated 16.09.2015 and 14.12.2015, Annexure A-2 and A-4 respectively.

3. Without commenting on the merits of the claim of the applicant, we deem it appropriate to dispose of this Application with a direction to the respondents to consider and pass consequential orders on the aforesaid representations of the applicant within a period of four weeks. In the event, the claim of the applicant is to be rejected, the same shall be by passing a reasoned order. Needless to say that the applicant shall have the liberty to seek redressal, if aggrieved. “Order Dasti”.

**(Nita Chowdhury)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Permod Kohli)**  
**Chairman**

/pj/