

Central Administrative Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi

O.A.No.409/2016

Monday, this the 3rd day of December 2018

Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Shrivastava, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)

1. Ms. Chhaya Goswami
Aged 34 years
d/o Dharampal Goswami
R/o H.No.B-4, Madhukunj Gali
Shivaji Road, North Ghonda
Delhi – 110 053
Post Special Educator
2. Ms. Alka
Aged 29 years
d/o Ompal Verma
R/o C-235, Gali No.08
Ganga Vihar, Near Gokul Puri
Delhi -110 094
Post Special Educator

..Applicants

(Mr. Tenzing Thinlay Lepcha, Advocate for Mr. Anuj K. Aggarwal, Advocate)

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Through its Chief Secretary
Delhi Secretariat
IP Estate, New Delhi – 110 002
2. Union of India through its Secretary
Ministry of Human Resource & Development
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi – 110 001
3. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board
(DSSSB)
Through the Chairman
Govt. of NCT of Delhi
FC-18, Institutional Area
Karkardooma, Delhi – 110 092
4. North Delhi Municipal Corporation (NDMC)
Through its Commissioner (North)
Dr. SPM Civil Centre
J L Nehru Marg
New Delhi – 110 002
5. South Delhi Municipal Corporation (SDMC)

Through its Commissioner (South)
23rd Floor, Civic Centre
Minto road, New Delhi – 110 002

6. East Municipal Corporation (EDMC)
Through its Commissioner (East)
Viswas Nagar Extension, Shahdara
Delhi – 110 032

..Respondents

(Mr. Subhash Gosain, Advocate for respondent No.2, Mrs. Anupama Bansal,
Advocate for respondent No.5 – *Nemo* for other respondents)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Mr. K.N. Shrivastava:

The main relief claimed by the applicant in this O.A. reads as under:-

“(i) Issue an appropriate order or direction thereby directing respondent no.1 to make the proposal to the respondent no.2 for grant of relaxation to the applicants in qualification of CTET in terms of Section 23 (2) of the RTE Act, 2009 and also direct respondent no.2/Central Government to consider the case of the applicants for grant of relaxation in the qualification of CTET”

2. Such a relief cannot be granted by the Tribunal. We hold that the applicant has indulged into infructuous litigation. In the normal course, we would have imposed fine in such case. However, we are restraining ourselves from doing so.

3. The O.A. is dismissed for the reasons mentioned hereinabove. No costs.

(S.N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(K.N. Shrivastava)
Member (A)

December 3, 2018
/sunil/