CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No.326/2019

New Delhi this the 30th day of January, 2019

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

Anju,Age 36
Group B, Fresh Appointment (PGT) Hindi
Roll No. 110311101170
D/o Jai Prakash
H. No. E-329A, Mandir Marg, Chhajjupur, East Babarpur,
Shahadra, Mayur Vihar Phase-3
Delhi-110032 ..... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr Tahir Asharf Siddiqui.)

Versus

1. Directorate of Education
Through its Secretary,
Govt. (NCT) of Delhi
Old Secretariat, Near Vidhan Sabha, Civil Lines
New Delhi, Delhi-110054.

2. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,
Through its Secretary FC-18
Institutional Area,
Karkardooma, Delhi. -Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A):-

The applicant has filed this OA, claiming the following reliefs:-

(i) Direct the Respondents to conduct a fair and transparent evaluation of the examination held on 23.07.2018 towards recruitment for notified vacancies in PGT-Hindi -Female (Post Code 111/17) vide advertisement notice 04/2017 dated 20.12.2017.

(ii) Direct the respondents to produce the record of the Examination dated 24.07.2018 and 25.07.2018 for post code 111/17, and the raw marks obtained by the Applicant before the application of normalization.

(iii) Direct the respondents to declare the Applicant as successful in the examination dated 23.07.2018 for PGT-Hindi (Female) (Post Code 111/17) and issue joining letter to the Applicant against the said notified vacancies for PGT-Hindi (Female) (Post Code 111/17).

(iv) Pass any such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice and in favour of the applicant."

2. When questioned, the applicant could not show how the above prayers are based on any rules/instructions listed in the advertisement with regard to the examination in question.

3. Counsel for the applicant is unable to show us any rules in which the respondents are bound to give them a copy of the OMRsheets marking etc.. On being asked about the same, he states that he does not wish to press the prayer but only wishes to draw attention to the fact that he has given some representation with regard to the result of PGT examination.

4. We have seen the representation. The representation does not even refer to the year of the examination and does not mention even the post code of the same. It is not understandable how any respondent can answer a representation like this. Clearly the OA is premature. Only

after an impugned order is passed, should an OA be instituted.

5. In view of the above, the OA is dismissed at the admission stage itself.

(S. N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/