

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

O.A. No.1402/2018

New Delhi, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)**  
**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)**

1. Sh. O.P. Meena  
S/o Late Shri J.N. Meena  
Aged about 55 years  
Working as Assistant Director  
M/o Tourism, GOI, Transport Bhawan  
1, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.  
R/o, I-206, Sarojini Nagar  
New Delhi ..... Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Sanjiv Joshi)

Versus

1. Union of India,  
Ministry of Tourism  
Through its Secretary  
Transport Bhawan  
1-Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Union of India,  
Ministry of Tourism  
Through its Additional Director General  
Transport Bhawan  
1-Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.
3. Ms. Padmani Brahmra  
Working as Assistant Director  
(Hotel & Restaurants Division)  
Ministry of Tourism  
C-1, Hutments Darashikoh Road  
New Delhi.
4. Ms. Shovna Sarangi (OM Div.)  
Working as Assistant Director  
Ministry of Tourism, Transport Bhawan

1-Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.

5. Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh  
Working as Assistant Director  
India Tourism, Ministry of Tourism  
GOI, 88, Janpath  
New Delhi-110001.
6. Mr. Sharad Saxena  
Working as Assistant Director (Admin-1)  
Ministry of Tourism, Transport Bhawan  
1-Parliament Street  
New Delhi-110001.
7. Ms. Banaja Behera  
Working as Assistant Director (IDD)  
Ministry of Tourism  
C-1, Hutments, Darashikoh Road  
New Delhi. .... Respondents

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

**Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J) :-**

Heard the learned counsel for applicant.

2. The applicant, an Assistant Director (AD), in the respondent Ministry has filed the instant OA questioning the Annexure-A/1 Office Memorandum dated 02.02.2018, whereunder the respondents proposed to conduct selection for 8 posts for ADs and 2 posts of TIOs for posting in Indian Tourism Offices overseas. It is the case of the applicant that though his case was also considered and he participated in the written examination and interview for the

said selection, the respondents may appoint certain ineligible persons by ignoring his claim and, hence the OA.

3. The OA is premature, as, admittedly, no final orders ignoring the claim of the applicant in the impugned selection process have been passed till date.

4. In the circumstances, the OA is dismissed as premature. However, the applicant is at liberty to avail his remedies in accordance with law, if any adverse orders are passed by the respondents in future. No costs.

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

**( V. Ajay Kumar )**  
**Member(J)**

/rk/