

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.679/2019

Wednesday, this the 27<sup>th</sup> day of February 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Sonal Panwar d/o Deepak Panwar  
Aged about 20 years  
r/o H.No.302, Shahpur Jat  
New Delhi – 49  
Group B

..Applicant

(Mr. Ranjit Sharma, Advocate)

Versus

1. DSSSB through its Secretary  
FC-18, Institutional Area  
Karkardooma,  
Delhi – 91
2. South Delhi Municipal Corporation  
Through the Commissioner  
SP Mukherjee Civic Centre  
JLN Marg,  
New Delhi - 02

..Respondents

(Mr. H A Khan, Advocate)

**O R D E R (ORAL)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**

The respondents issued Advertisement No.01/18 for the post of Teacher (Primary) in Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD). The applicant states that though she belongs to OBC category, she mentioned her social status as 'UR', i.e., un-reserved category, in the application form, because of some technical snag

and that her case is not being considered under the category of OBC. This O.A. is filed claiming reliefs in that behalf.

2. We heard Mr. Ranjit Sharma, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. H A Khan, learned counsel for respondents.

3. The applicant was required to mention her social status in the application form. It is not in dispute that she mentioned it as 'UR'. Even if she actually belongs to OBC category, she cannot claim the rights with reference to that social status, once she has filled the application as a candidate of 'UR' category.

4. The plea raised by the applicant is that there was a technical snag in the system, and the same did not accept her social status as 'OBC' and left with no alternative, she mentioned it as 'UR'. If that were to be so, it should not have been possible for anyone to upload the application with the social status as 'OBC'. When the system accepted the applications of other OBC candidates, it is difficult to imagine that it refused to accept uploading the particulars of the applicant alone.

5. We do not find any merit in this O.A. It is accordingly dismissed. We, however, leave it open to the applicant to make a representation to the respondents in this behalf and it is for the

latter to consider the feasibility of granting any relief, in accordance with law.

There shall be no order as to costs.

**( Mohd. Jamshed )**  
**Member (A)**

**( Justice L. Narasimha Reddy )**  
**Chairman**

**February 27, 2019**  
/sunil/