

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**C.P. No.268/2019 in
O.A. No.812/2019**

New Delhi, this the 5th day of August, 2019

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

Kavita,
D/o Shri Satbir Singh,
Aged about 30 years,
Group 'C'
R/o H.No.A-23, Village & P.O. Rani Khera,
Opp. Booster Pump, Shani Bazar Road,
Delhi. .. Petitioner

(By Advocate : Shri K.P. Gupta)

Versus

Ms. Gitanjali Gupta,
Chairperson,
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board,
FC-18, Institutional Area,
Karkardooma, Delhi-110092. .. Respondent

(By Advocate : Ms. Esha Mazumdar with
Shri Amit Anand)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman

The petitioner filed O.A. No. 812/2019 in connection with the appointment to the post of TGT (Natural Science) in the GNCT of Delhi. The selection process was

conducted by the Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board (DSSSB). The O.A. was disposed of on 12.03.2019, leaving it open to the applicant to submit a representation to the respondents to indicate : (a) as to how many vacancies of OBC/Female in the post of TGT (Natural Science) were filled up and (b) if all the posts are not filled up, the reasons therefor.

2. This Contempt Petition is filed alleging that the respondents did not comply with the orders of this Tribunal.

3. The Respondent filed a compliance affidavit. It is submitted that a detailed order dated 22.07.2019 has been passed replying to the questions asked by the applicant. It is stated that as against 20 vacancies earmarked for OBC category, 16 vacancies are already filled up and candidature of remaining four candidates is kept pending for want of clarification. The other steps that are said to have been taken with regard to selection are also indicated.

4. The applicant filed a rejoinder disputing the contents of the compliance affidavit.

5. We heard Shri K.P. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Esha Mazumdar with Shri Amit Anand, learned counsel for the respondent - DSSSB.

6. The only direction issued in the O.A. was to enable the applicant to seek information on two important aspects. Though with some delay, the respondent answered the questions of the applicant. If the applicant is not satisfied with the answers given or stand taken by the respondent, it shall always be open to her to pursue the remedies, in accordance with law.

7. We, therefore, close the Contempt Petition, leaving it open to the petitioner to pursue the remedies, in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/jyoti/