

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 291/176/2018**

**DATE OF ORDER:** 25.04.2018

**CORAM**

**HON'BLE MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**  
**HON'BLE MR. SURESH KUMAR MONGA, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Khem Chand Mahawar S/o Shri Ramdev Mahawar, age 38 years, by caste Koli, R/o House No. 284/368, Sahu Nagar, Cement Factory, Sawaimadhopur (Rajasthan) - For apply post on Group-D, of Railway Recruitment Board, New Delhi.

....Applicant

Mr. Banwari Lal Kundariya, counsel for applicant.

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through Chairman of Railway Board, Federation of Railway Officers Association, office address-256-A, Railway Bhawan, Raisina Road, New Delhi 110001.
2. General Secretary of Railway Board, Address-256-A, Railway Bhawan, Raisina Road, New Delhi - 110001.

....Respondents

**ORDER (oral)**

**Per: MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

Through this O.A., the applicant is seeking quashing of recruitment advertisement brought out by Railway Recruitment Board dated 10.02.2018 on the ground that the age limit provided in para 5 of the advertisement notice be reckoned from the years of occurrence of vacancies. It is the contention of the applicant that had the posts been advertised when vacancies occurred, applicant would have become eligible for the posts advertised in this recruitment notice. He prays that the age relaxation for reserved candidates should be enhanced over and above what is already stipulated in advertisement.

2. First of all, a perusal of this advertisement notice does not indicate the years of vacancies, which have been taken into reckoning to calculate the total number of posts to be filled and, therefore, there is nothing on record to corroborate the assertion of the applicant on this issue. Further, when asked whether his contention is supported by any law or rule or any judgment to this respect, the applicant's counsel replied in the negative but stated that he feels that such relaxation should be granted from the year of vacancy.

3. Such contention does not seem in consonance with the existing rule position and such argument is not supported by any material placed in the OA. Given these facts, we are unable to entertain this O.A. for want of merit at admission stage itself.

4. We, accordingly, dismiss the Original Application in limine. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(SURESH KUMAR MONGA)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**