

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**O.A. No.3690/2017**

**New Delhi this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2017**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PERMOD KOHLI, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. K.N. SHRIVASTAVA, MEMBER (A)**

Sri Karthikeyan Gokulchandran, IPS,  
Aged about 29 years,  
No.94/95, Sripadam,  
Behind 4<sup>th</sup> Cross, Royal Shelters Layout,  
D.C. Halli, IIM-B Post,  
Bengaluru-560076.

....

Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Sanjoy Ghosh with Ms. Arunima Kedia)

Versus

1. Union of India  
Represented by its Union Home Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block,  
Police-I Division (IPS-IV Section),  
New Delhi-110001.

2. Union Public Service Commission,  
Represented by its Chairman,  
Sangh Lok Seva Ayog,  
Dhoulpur House,  
Shahjahan Road,  
New Delhi-110069.

.....

Respondents

(By Advocate: Dr. L.C. Singhi for R. No. 1 and Sh. R.V. Sinha and  
Sh. A.S. Singh for R. No. 2)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman**

Heard learned counsel for the applicant. Dr. L. C. Singhi, learned counsel has appeared for respondent no. 1 and Sh. A.S. Singh for respondent no. 2 on advance notice.

2. This OA has been filed seeking to challenge the order dated 25.10.2016 (Annexure A/1) whereby representation of the applicant for cadre allocation has been rejected. The applicant appeared in CSE-2013. He was selected in the said examination and was allocated State of Kerala. The applicant however claimed his allocation i.e., State of Rajasthan or Maharashtra. State of Kerala was the ninth preference of the applicant. His grievance is that he should have been allocated any other State cadre in the order of his preference. The applicant made representations seeking the re-allocation of State cadre. The applicant had earlier approached this Tribunal by filing OA No. 2230/2016. This OA was disposed of vide order dated 13.07.2016 with direction to the respondents to take decision on the representation of the applicant. The applicant was also permitted to make a fresh representation. Consequent upon the aforesaid direction, the respondents have passed the impugned order dated 25.10.2016, communicated to the applicant vide letter dated 27.10.2016 (Annexure-A/1). The respondents have passed a

speaking and reasoned order consequent upon the directions to this effect.

3. We have examined the impugned order. In Para 10 of the speaking order, there is a clear answer to the plea of the applicant. No person with lesser merit has been allocated to other States as per preferences of the applicant. Under the rules, cadre is allocated by taking into consideration, the preference, merit of the candidate and availability of vacancy. It is sought to be projected that the contention raised in the representation that five officers did not join has not been specifically dealt with. We are unable to appreciate this contention as this aspect is taken care of, as given in Para 10 itself. For the above reason and looking into the reasoned and speaking order, we do not find any merit in this petition which is dismissed accordingly.

**(K.N. SHRIVASTAVA)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(JUSTICE PERMOD KOHLI)**  
**CHAIRMAN**

/ns/