CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA NO.3364/2015

NEW DELHI THIS THE 22ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2016

HON'BLE MR. P.K. BASU, MEMBER (A)
HON'BLE DR BRAHM AVTAR AGRAWAL, MEMBER (J)

Ms. Preety,
Aged 22 years,
Group 'C'
(Post applied for Data Entry Operator),
W/o Shri Yaspal Saroha,
D/o Shri Satbir Lakra,
R/o House No.1152/13,
Near Haryana Hospital,
Janta Colony, Sonepat-131001. …Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Ashish Nischal)

VERSUS

1. Staff Selection Commission,
Through its Secretary,
Block -12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.

2. Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Department of Personnel & Training,
North Block,
New Delhi-110001. …Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Yogesh Mohan for Mr. Gyanendra Singh)

ORDER (Oral)

HON'BLE MR P.K. BASU, MEMBER (A):

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant.

2. The applicant appeared for selection for the post of Data Entry Operator (DEO) and Lower Division Clerk (LDC) against the advertisement of Staff Selection Commission (SSC) dated 19.07.2014. She appeared for the examination of written test and Data Entry Skill Test. She cleared the written test but unfortunately the SSC cancelled the written examination and the applicant was also asked to appear for the second written examination.

The contention of the applicant is that the SSC had not cancelled the examination held at the centre in which she had appeared. The applicant appeared for the second written examination but admittedly she could not qualify. She secured 104 marks as against cut-off marks of 111 for DEO and 105 for LDC for general candidates. The contention of the applicant is that since the first written examination at the centre that she appeared has not been cancelled, therefore, her marks obtained in the first written examination should be counted instead of second examination in which she has not been selected. It is stated that in the first examination she secured 154.75 marks as against the cut-off of 120.25 for general candidates.

3. Per contra, learned proxy counsel for the respondents states that the applicant appeared as a general candidate in Paper I and cleared it but she could not clear Paper II as the cut-off marks in Paper II for general candidates was 111 for DEO and 105 for LDC, whereas she obtained 104. It is stated that the re-examination was not held for the applicant's centre for Paper I. The applicant is confusing the Paper II examination which she appeared in to be the re-examination for Paper I. Thus, this OA has been filed on misplaced understanding and there is no cause of action at all.

4. The OA is, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

(Dr. Brahm Avtar Agrawal)
Member (J)

(P.K. Basu)
Member (A)

/jk/