

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

O.A No. 958/2015

New Delhi this the 14th day of December, 2016

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. P. K. Basu, Member (A)

Rajeev Agarwal
S/o. Dr. G. P. Agarwal
Presently working as :
Advisor (DP), DoT, New Delhi.

Resident of
C1/47, Bapa Nagar,
Near Delhi High Court,
New Delhi-110 003.

.....Applicant

(Advocate : None)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through
The Secretary
Department of Telecommunication
M/o. Communication & IT, Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Cabinet Secretary,
Cabinet Secretariat,
President's House,
New Delhi-110 004.
3. The Secretary,
Union Public Service Commission
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi-110 069.
4. Department of Personnel & Training,
Through the Secretary (Personnel),
DoPT, Government of India,
New Delhi – 110 004.
5. The Secretary,
Central Vigilance Commission
Satarkta Bhawan, I.N.A.,

New Delhi - 110 029.

6. Sh. N. K. Yadav
Member (Services),
Room No. 213, Sanchar Bhawan,
20 Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110 002.
7. Sh. S. S. Sirohi
Member (Technology)
Room No. 211, Sanchar Bhawan,
20 Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110 001.Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. R. K. Jain for R-1, Mr. Gyanendra Singh for R-2, Mr. Ravinder Aggarwal with Mr. Amit Yadav for R-3, Mr. Arvind Kumar Shukla with Mr. Amit Shukla for R-6 & 7 and None for remaining respondents.)

O R D E R (O R A L)

Justice M. S. Sullar, Member (J)

As is evident from the record that the applicant has preferred the instant Original Application (O.A), as back as on 5th March, 2015, challenging the selection process for the post of Member (Technology & Services) in the office of respondent – Union of India, being arbitrary and illegal.

2. The respondents have refuted the claim of the applicant and filed the reply, stoutly denying all the allegations and grounds contained in O.A and prayed for its dismissal.

3. Having completed the pleadings, the case was listed for arguments for today.

4. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondents has submitted, that since even the incumbent upon the indicated post has already retired after attaining the age of superannuation, so the instant O.A has become infructuous.

5. Perhaps that is the reason nobody is appearing on behalf of applicant, today.

6. Since, nobody is appearing on behalf of the applicant to argue the matter, despite repeated calls, so we have no option but to dismiss the case in default.

7. Therefore, the O.A is hereby dismissed in default, on account of non-prosecution.

(P. K. Basu)
Member (A)

(Justice M. S. Sullar)
Member (J)
14.12.2016

/Mbt/