

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A.No.3744/2017

Friday, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of October 2017

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Shrivastava, Member (A)**

Kuldeep Singh s/o Mr. Balwan Singh  
r/o VPO Taj Pur Kalan, Delhi – 110 036

Aged about 32 years  
(Group 'B')  
(Candidate to the post of Primary Teacher (Post Code 16/17))

..Applicant

(Mr. Ajesh Luthra, Advocate)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Through its Chief Secretary  
A Wing, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Delhi Secretariat  
IP Estate, New Delhi
2. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB)  
Through its Chairman  
FC-18, Karkardooma Institutional Area  
Delhi – 92
3. South Delhi Municipal Corporation  
Through its Commissioner  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Civic Centre, New Delhi

..Respondents

(Mr. N K Singh, Advocate for Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Advocate for respondent Nos.  
1 & 2 - Mr. R K Jain, Advocate for respondent No.3)

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

**Justice Permod Kohli:**

Notice.

2. Mr. N K Singh for Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, learned counsel and Mr. R K Jain, learned counsel, appear and accept notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 & 2 and respondent No.3 respectively.

3. This is a similar petition where a large number of candidates have approached this Tribunal seeking indulgence for permission to appear in the examination for the post of Teacher (Primary) under Post Code No.16/17. It has already been observed that the system of respondent No.2 (DSSSB) is faulty. Even when the applications have been accepted in the system, the fee is not being accepted. In some cases, after the fee was paid, there is reverse entry in the bank account and the status report obtained from the official website indicates that the fee is pending and on that basis the aggrieved candidates have been denied the admit card to enable them to appear in the examination, which is scheduled to be held on 29.10.2017. In the present case also, we find that the applicant applied within the prescribed time. He has even paid the fee, as is evident from the bank statement of SBI (Annexure A/3). The amount has been debited from the account. The applicant has also placed on record the status report dated 25.10.2017 (Annexure A/5), which indicates the status of the application. The application has been received, but the receipt of the fee at DSSSB is shown to be pending, which is contrary to the bank statement.

4. We have already allowed similar petitions with a direction to respondent No.2 (DSSSB) to issue the admit card to the applicant to enable him/her to appear in the ensuing examination scheduled to be held on 29.10.2017.

5. Mr. Ajesh Luthra, learned counsel for applicant submits that the similarly situated persons are being compelled to approach this Tribunal. We fail to understand that as to why respondent No.2 (DSSSB) is compelling the candidates to approach the Tribunal when similar petitions

have been disposed of directing the DSSSB to issue admit card. As a matter of fact, respondent No.2 itself should have entertained the requests of similarly circumstanced to issue the admit card. The candidates are being forced to approach the Tribunal spending lot of money merely because of the faulty system of the DSSSB.

6. In these circumstances, while disposing of this O.A., we direct respondent No.2 (DSSSB) to issue admit card to the applicant today itself. We further make it clear that respondent No.2 should entertain the requests of similarly situated candidates by issuing the admit card. We also reserve the right to impose the compensatory cost against respondent No.2, if any candidate suffers on account of non-implementation of the aforesaid directions.

A copy of this order be issued **dasti** to the parties under the signatures of the Court Officer.

**( K.N. Shrivastava )**  
**Member (A)**

**( Justice Permod Kohli )**  
**Chairman**

**October 27, 2017**  
/sunil/