

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench**

**OA No.2546/2019**

New Delhi, this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019

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

Sh. Ankit Chaudhary  
Aged about 26 years  
S/o Sh. Satish Kumar  
R/o H. No.97, Pooth Kalan  
Delhi-110086.  
Post PGT Sociology(Male)  
Post code: 129/17, Group 'B'

... Applicant

(By Advocates: Shri Anuj Aggarwal assisted by Shri  
Tenzing Thinlay Lepcha )

Vs.

1. Delhi Subordinate Services  
Selection Board (DSSSB)  
Through its Chairman  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
FC-18, Institutional Area  
Karkardooma, Delhi-110092.

2. The Director of Education  
Directorate of Education  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Old Secretariat Building  
Civil Lines, Delhi-110054.

...Respondents

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:-**

The first respondent invited applications for  
appointment to the post of PGT Sociology (Male) (Post

Code 129/2017), through advertisement dated 20.12.2017. The process included conducting of a test of multiple choices. It is stated that after participation in the examination, the applicant noticed that the answers provided for in the draft key, for as many as six questions, were wrong and accordingly made representation. The applicant states that his contention was accepted and the key was also altered before it was published finally. His grievance is that though his contentions were accepted, he was not awarded the marks for the concerned questions. He made representation and even got a legal notice issued on 29.07.2019 to the respondents, and complains that the respondents have not taken any action thereon.

2. We heard Shri Anuj Aggarwal, learned counsel for the applicant at the stage of admission itself.

3. The grievance of the applicant as regards the correctness of the answers in the key stood redressed. His present grievance is only about the award of marks to certain questions. The respondents have their own

mechanism, evolved in this behalf. The representation made by the applicant needs to be considered and if there is a facility for recounting or recalculation of marks, the same can be extended to the applicant. If, on the other hand, the request made by the applicant cannot be acceded to, even that needs to be communicated.

4. We, therefore, dispose of the OA directing the respondents to pass orders on the representation made by the applicant within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

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

/vb/