

Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi

O.A. No. 1624/2016

This the 10th day of May, 2016

Hon'ble Shri Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A) Hon'ble Shri Raj Vir Sharma, Member(J)

Ms. Anju Devi,
W/o Shri Ankit Kasana,
R/o Village Kotwalpur, Post Chirori,
Ghaziabad, U.P.

Aged about 26 Years
(Candidate towards Combined Graduate Level Examination-2015)
...Applicant

(Mr. Ajesh Luthra)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through its Secretary
DOPT
North Block
New Delhi.
2. Staff Selection Commission
Through its Chairman
(Head Quarter)
Block No. 12, C.G.O. Complex
Lodhi Colony,
New Delhi.
3. Staff Selection Commission
Through Regional Director (NWR)
Staff Selection Commission
Block No.3, Ground Floor,
Kendriya Sadan, Sector-9
Chandigarh -167017

Order (oral)

Hon'ble Mr. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)

The grievance of the applicant is that despite appearing in the Tier II of the Combined Graduate Level

Exam, the respondents have not declared her result allegedly on the grounds of mismatch of handwriting/signatures.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant argued that in a similar matter in OA No. 1286/2016 in the case of one Ms. Arti Rani, who obtained second rank in the same examination, this Tribunal vide its order dated 07.04.2016 has given the following directions:

"3. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the applicant was a candidate for the post of Data Entry Operator(DEO) and Lowe Division Clerk(LDC). The vacancies having been notified by the Staff Selection Commission (SSC), she was issued an Admit Card under Roll No. 3011609938. The result of the selection came to be declared on 09.10.2015. the applicant is shown to have secured 357.25 marks and was declared successful with 2nd rank in the selection list for the post of DEO in CAG. It is stated that all other selectees except the applicant were appointed. The applicant received a show cause notice dated 26.11.2015 alleging that she has indulged in malpractice/unfair means in the written examination. She was asked to submit certain documents and furnish her explanation. The applicant replied to the said show case notice. She also sought information under the RTI Act, 2005. However, no written reply was provided to her. It is stated that on enquiry, the applicant was informed that the documents relation to her examination have been sent to Forensic Experts for handwriting/signature match/mismatch opinion. The applicant has also made a representation dated 22.03.2016 (AnnexureA-9).

4. The grievance of the applicant is that the respondents have not taken any decision either on

the representation or in respect of her appointment for the post on the basis of her selection.

5. Keeping in view the above circumstances, we dispose of this Application with the direction to the respondents to ensure that the necessary information from the concerned Forensic Laboratory is obtained within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and on consideration of the opinion of the expert, consequential decision be taken within a period of two weeks thereafter."

3. Learned counsel argued that this case being similar, can also be disposed of in terms of the same order.

4. It has been submitted that the case of the applicant has been referred to forensic expert, whose report is awaited.

5. In view of the aforesaid submissions, we dispose of this OA at the admission stage itself without issuing notice to the respondents and without going into the merits of the case with a direction to the respondents to extend the benefits of the order dated 07.04.2016 to the applicant herein as well.

No costs.

(Raj Vir Sharma)
Member (J)

(Shekhar Agarwal)
Member (A)

/sarita/