

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

O.A. No. 345/2019

New Delhi this the 7th day of February, 2019

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

Manisha Kumari Varun,
Roll No. 110211101532
Group B, Subject: Appointment,
D/o Devendra Kumar,
House No.V-150, Near Khajoorwali Gali,
Arvind Mohalla, Ghonda,
Delhi-110053 - Applicant

(None)

Versus

1. Directorate of Education
Through its Director,
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. Nobody is present for the applicant. Even on the previous occasion, none had appeared for the applicant. Hence, we proceed with the matter under Rule 15 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987. Earlier also, we had disposed of similar matters

3. We have also perused the record and not able to understand how the above prayers are based on any rules/instructions listed in the advertisement with regard to the examination in question. There is also no rule in which the respondents are bound to give them a copy of the OMRsheets marking etc..

4. We have seen a representation dated 26.12.2018 (Annexure A-7). 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 as being premature and for lack of jurisdiction.

(S. N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/