

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**CP No. 642/2018
O.A. No.2394/2015**

New Delhi this the 15th day of February, 2019

**HON'BLE MS. NITA CHOWDHURY, MEMBER (A)
HON'BLE MR. S.N. TERDAL, MEMBER (J)**

Dhiraj Goswami, S/o Sh. Madan Pal,
R/o D-60, G-1 Dilshad Colony-110095
Aged about 40 years - Applicant

(By Advocate: Mrs. Bimla Devi for Mr. Ajesh Luthra)

Versus

1. Sh. Anshu Prakash, Chief Secretary,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
A-Wing, 5th Floor, Delhi Secretariat,
IP Estate, New Delhi
2. Sh. Rajesh Arora, Secretary,
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
FC-18, Institutional Area,
Karkardooma, Delhi-110092
3. Sh. Sanjeev Kumar,
Principal Secretary,
(Health), GNCT of Delhi,
Delhi Secretariat,
9th Level, A-Wing, New Delhi - Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Ajesh Kr. Sharma)

ORDER (ORAL)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A):-

This Contempt Petition has been filed seeking compliance with the order of this Tribunal dated 13.11.2017 passed in OA which reads as under:-

“9. We have carefully considered the record and are indeed surprised to find that even though the qualification for all the post codes was identical, it has been stated by the learned counsel for the respondents that the applicant does not qualify for being selected to this preferred post code 20/13. It appears that some error has been committed in assessing the suitability of the applicant for post code 20/13. We, therefore, direct the suitability of the applicant for post code 20/13. We, therefore, direct the respondents to re-examine the case of the applicant and consider him for the post code 20/13 (if otherwise eligible) for which he specifically applied, and which he appears to have qualified in, on merit too. This exercise shall be completed within two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. We, accordingly allow the OA. No costs.”

2. In compliance with the above order, the respondents have passed a detailed order in which they themselves have stated the factual position with regard to the claims of the applicant of this OA.
3. Quite clearly, the respondents have also sent a copy of the same to Dhiraj Goswami (applicant herein) by post.
4. In view of the substantial compliance with the order of this Tribunal, notices are discharged and the CP is accordingly closed.

5. However, liberty is given to the applicant to challenge the decision now passed by the respondents, if so advised, in accordance with law.

(S. N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/