

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

O.A. No.2863 of 2016

This the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2019

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)**

Preeti Saini, aged about 28 years,  
D/o Sh.Jai Prakash Saini,  
R/o H.No.6, Street No.2, Conductor Colony,  
Buraru, Delhi-110084  
Lastly employed at GSKV, Magazine Road,  
School I.D. 1207112

....Applicant  
(None present)

VERSUS

1. GNCT of Delhi, through,  
Its Chief Secretary,  
I.P.State, Govt. of NCT of Delhi,  
New Delhi.
2. Director of Education,  
Directorate of Education,  
Old Secretariat, Civil Lines,  
Delhi-54
3. The Joint Director (Planning Branch),  
Planning Branch, Directorate of Education,  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,  
Old Patrachar Building,  
Timarpur, Delhi-54.

.....Respondents  
(By Advocate : Shri Vijay Pandita)

**ORDER (Oral)**

**Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A):**

None is present for the applicant today. On previous date of hearing, i.e., on 2.1.2019, this Tribunal passed the following orders:-

“On 18.07.2017, counsel for the applicant had requested that the matter be listed at an early date and he undertook to inform the respondents in this regard. Today, nobody appears for the applicant.

This OA has been filed by the applicant seeking to be considered as eligible in terms of the Recruitment Rules as a Guest Teacher (PGT) (Hindi) for the academic Session 2016-17.

The respondents were heard. The respondents point out that contrary to the averment in the OA, the online application of the applicant filled in by her while applying for the post in question has been annexed by them at page 76 and as per the application, which we have perused, there is no mention of a Postgraduation having done by the applicant. In fact, the details furnished online only show BA. B.Ed., CTET qualifications. Hence, *prima facie*, the applicant does not fulfill the minimum eligibility qualification. The relief asked for is against the academic year 2016-17 which is long over. Since then, the recruitments are being done on annual basis while the relief asked for is for her appointment during the academic year 2016-17. No interim relief was granted in this matter. Hence, nothing remains to be decided as per the respondents.

The respondents further state that she has taken the subject Hindi for only one year of her post graduation course.

Matter is kept on board as part-heard and the applicant is given a last opportunity to argue the matter.”

Today, also nobody appears for applicant, so matter is disposed off under Rule 15 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987.

2. In view of the above facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is of the considered view that the present OA

deserves to be dismissed in view of the aforesaid observations as neither the applicant nor her counsel appeared today to pursue or advance arguments in support of applicant's claim.

3. Accordingly, the present OA is dismissed being devoid of merit as this Court is also of the considered view that the applicant does not fulfill the requisite qualification for the post in question as per the RRs of the post in question when she applied as is evident from the online application form annexed by the respondents with their counter affidavit. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(S.N. Terdal)**  
**Member (J)**

**(Nita Chowdhury)**  
**Member (A)**

/ravi/