

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA 4572/2015
MA 5/2017
MA 599/2018
MA 2548/2016

Reserved on 18.07.2018
Pronounced on 23 .07.2018

**Hon'ble Ms. Praveen Mahajan, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. S.N.Terdal, Member (J)**

Sumati Kumari,
W/o Birandra Kumar Jha,
r/o D-445, Sector-1, Avantika,
Rohini, New Delhi. ... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. S.N.Sharma)

VERSUS

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Through Secretary,
I.P.Estate, Delhi.
2. Chairman/Controller
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection
Board, FC-18, Institutional Area,
Karkardooma, Delhi-110092. ... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. K.M.Singh)

O R D E R

Mr.S.N.Terdal, Member (J):

Heard Shri S.N.Sharma, counsel for the applicant and Shri K.M.Singh, counsel for the respondents, perused the pleadings and all the documents produced by both the parties.

2. The relevant facts of the case are that the applicant had applied for the post of TGT Sanskrit (Female) with the Post Code No. 117/2012 in response to the advertisement No. 2/2012 issued by respondent No 2, Delhi Subordinate Staff Selection Board. Earlier she had filed OA No. 4720/2014. By virtue of the order passed in that OA, she secured

admit card and participated in the examination process held in the year 2014. Now after the examination is over, she has filed the present OA praying for a direction to the respondents for declaring the result and issuing the market sheet and appointing her against the said posts. In the meantime, the respondents have rejected her case stating that the said rejection was in compliance with the final order dated 20.03.2015 passed in batch of cases including OA No. 4720/2014. The counsel for the applicant vehemently submitted that in view of the order passed by this Tribunal in the above said batch of matters on 20.03.2015, the relief prayed for by the applicant should be granted.

3. The counsel for the respondents vehemently submitted that the case of the applicant is rejected following the said order and he drawn our attention to para 5 of the said order which clearly states that the applicant had been given liberty to make individual representation within one week from 20.03.2015 and within three weeks thereafter the respondents have to dispose of the said representation with a reasoned and speaking order. The said para is extracted below:-

“In the circumstances, we dispose of the aforementioned Original Applications with liberty to the applicants to make individual representations to the Board within one week from today and a direction to the Board to decide the same within three weeks thereafter by way of reasoned and speaking order. It is made clear that the time limit of three weeks is outer limit for disposal of the representations and in such cases where the dates of interview have been finalized the respondents may consider the representations on priority.”

4. In the present case, the applicant has not filed any representation and also she has not challenged the said order passed by the respondents rejecting declaration of her result for non compliance of the above said order dated 20.03.2015 giving her

liberty to file representation. He has further contended that as the selection process was over long-ago in 2015 and also lakhs of candidates appeared. As such, it is not possible to re-open the case of the applicant. In our opinion, that the applicant was not vigilant. She has not taken timely steps. She has not acted as per the liberty given by this Tribunal in her earlier OA 4720/2014 vide order dated 20.03.2015.

5. In view of the same, the OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(S.N.Terdal)
Member (J)

(Praveen Mahajan)
Member (A)

'sk'