

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA No.2627/2018

New Delhi this the 4th day of January, 2019

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

Ms. Tarun Tomar, aged about 25 years,
D/o Ravinder Singh,
H.No.K-2/1, Police Station,
Model Town, North-West Delhi
Delhi-110009

- Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Amit Gautam)

Versus

1. Union of India through
Staff Selection Commission,
Northern Region,
Block No.12, 5th Floor,
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi-110003, India

2. Dy. Commissioner of Police,
Recruitment Cell,
New Police Line,
Kingsway Camp
New Delhi-110009

- Respondents

(By Advocates: Mr. C. Bheemanama for R-1
Mrs. P.K. Gupta for R-2)

ORDER (Oral)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury:

This OA has been filed by the applicant, seeking the following reliefs:-

- “a) Issue Writ of Certiorari to quash the following order:-
Office Memorandum No.F. No.20/1/2016-C1/1 dated 09.02.2018 issued by the Respondent No.1 (ANNEXURE A-1) as the same is arbitrary, illegal, unjust and the same is in contravention of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India apart from being in violation of principles of natural justice; and
- b) issue a direction for offering the applicant appointment to the post of Constable (Female) in Delhi Police in the OBC category with all the consequential benefits; and
- c) allow the Applicant to file the OBC certificate and direct the Respondents to consider her appointment to the post of Constable (Female) in the Delhi Police in the OBC category; date of submission of the OBC certificate i.e. 10.09.2017 in a particular format;
- d) to issue any other relief, appropriate order or directions as this Hon’ble Tribunal deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice and equity.”

2. When the matter is taken up, counsel for the respondent no.1 draws our attention to the prayers in this OA and the fact that no order has been impugned in which the name of the applicant is mentioned. In fact, the said impugned order pertains to persons other than the applicant. Therefore, we find that this OA is not

properly drafted and no relief can be given without any impugned order. Hence, the applicant is heard and he seeks permission to withdraw the OA and to file the same afresh with better particulars of the impugned orders.

3. In view of the aforesaid submission made by the applicant's counsel, this OA is dismissed as withdrawn. However, the applicant is given liberty to file the OA afresh with better particulars of the impugned orders, in accordance with law. No order as to costs.

(S.N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/