

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No.4541/2014  
MA No.2968/2015

New Delhi this the 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2016

**Hon'ble Shri Sudhir Kumar, Member (A)**  
**Hon'ble Shri A.K.Bhardwaj, Member (J)**

1. Snesh Kumar,  
Roll No.2201060605,  
Aged about 24 years,  
S/o Sh. Mohan Lal,  
R/p VPO Balroad, Teh. Charkhi Dadri,  
Distt. Bhiwani, Haryana.
2. Mohammad Amir,  
Roll No.3001608202  
Aged about 22 years  
S/o Sh. Mohammad Islam,  
R/o H.No.201, Singh Gun House  
Wali Gali, Karhal Road,  
Mainpuri-205001 (UP).
3. Vinit Kumar  
Roll No.2201050724,  
Aged about 22 years,  
S/o Sh. Parkash Chand,  
R/o C-3/60, Sadatpur Extn.,  
New Delhi.
4. Ballender Singh  
Roll No.2201079871,  
Aged about 26 years,  
S/o Sh. Lachaman Singh,  
R/o H.No.1505, Street No.9,  
Dharam Vihar Colony,  
Bahadurgarh, Jhajjar,  
Haryana-124507.

...Applicants

(By Advocate: None)

VERSUS

1. Union of India

Through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block, New Delhi.

(OA No.4541/2014)

(2)

2. Inspector General (HQ)  
Directorate General, ITBP,  
Block-II, CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.
3. Staff Selection Commission  
Through its Chairman,  
C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road,  
New Delhi-110003.
4. Commandant (Rectt.)  
Recruitment Cell,  
Directorate General, ITBP,  
Block-II, CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road, New Delhi. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Gyanendra Singh for R-1, R-2 and R-4 &  
Shri S.M.Arif for R-3)

### **ORDER (ORAL)**

#### **Per Sudhir Kumar, Member (A):**

Case called twice. None appears for the applicants. Learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 4, and the learned counsel for the Respondent No.3 are present, and submit that this case is squarely covered by the judgment of the Bangalore Bench of this Tribunal in OA No.1180/2013 titled as **Shri Sudhir Haresh Belagali vs. Union of India and Another**, filed by them through Annexure R-1 of their counter reply.

2. It is seen that there was also no representation on behalf of the applicants on 07.12.2015. It is apparent that the applicants have lost interest in pursuing their case, and,

therefore, the case is dismissed in default and for non-prosecution.

(Raj Vir Sharma)

Member (J)

(Sudhir Kumar)

Member (A)

/kdr/