

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**O.A. No. 2825/2015**

New Delhi, this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2019

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

Bablu Singh, Aged 40 years  
S/o Mr. Ram Singh  
R/o House No.252 B, F-Block  
Street No.5, Ganga Vihar  
Gokulpuri, Delhi-110094.

.. Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Bikram Singh for  
Shri Saurabh Banerjee)

Versus

1. Ministry of Human Resources Development  
Government of India  
Through its Secretary  
Curzon Road Barracks  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg  
New Delhi-110001.

2. Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan  
Through its Chairman  
18, Institutional Area  
Shaheed Jeet Singh Marg  
New Delhi-110016.

.. Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri S. Rajappa)

**O R D E R (ORAL)****Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**

The Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS), the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein, issued an Advertisement No.10 in the year 2015, inviting applications for selection/appointment to various posts, including the post of TGT. B.Ed. is treated as one of the essential qualifications for that post. The applicant states that he studied B.Ed. (Special Education) Course, which is recognised by the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) and other agency; and still that is not treated as a valid qualification by the respondents.

2. This O.A. is filed with a prayer to quash the Advertisement dated 23.05.2015, in so far as it did not recognise the B.Ed. (Special Education) Degree, and to direct the respondents to grant other ancillary benefits.

3. The applicant contends that the NCTE has issued Notification dated 23.08.2010, indicating that the B.Ed. (Special Education) shall be treated as B.Ed.(General) in

relation to the subjects, as recognised by the Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI); and the same was not taken into account, by the respondents.

4. We heard Shri Bikram Singh, proxy counsel for Shri Saurabh Banerjee, learned Counsel for the applicant and Shri S. Rajappa, learned counsel for the respondents.

5. The only question that arises for consideration is as to whether the B.Ed. (Special Education), said to have been studied by the applicant, can be treated as valid and equivalent to B.Ed. (General) for the post of TGT, advertised by the respondents. In the Advertisement, except stating that the candidate should possess the professional qualification of B.Ed. as on the date of submission of application, nothing further is stipulated. Though in respect of the post of PGT, it was stated that the B.Ed. (Special Education) shall not be treated as valid qualification, such a stipulation does not exist as regards the post of TGT. Further, once the NCTE as well as RCI have issued notifications/clarifications declaring the

B.Ed. (Special Education) as equivalent to B.Ed.(General), the respondents cannot ignore the same.

6. It is not known whether the applicant is still interested in pursuing the remedies claimed in this O.A. If he is otherwise interested, he can approach the respondents with a representation, enclosing the Notification issued by the NCTE and letter dated 03.06.2007 issued by the RCI.

7. We, therefore, dispose of the O.A. leaving it open to the applicant to approach the respondents with a representation, along with a copy of this order and enclosing the Notifications issued by the NCTE and RCI within 4 weeks from today. If such a representation is made, the respondents shall take necessary steps in that behalf, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of such a representation. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

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

/jyoti/