

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

**OA No.1475/2019
MA No. 1709/2019**

New Delhi this the 18th day of November, 2019

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

Jyoti, D/o Rohtash,
R/o VPO Ikkas, Distt. Jind,
Teh Jind, Haryana-126102
Aged about 23 years
(Group C')
(Candidate to the post of Sub Inspector (Female)
Delhi Police

- Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. Ajesh Luthra)

VERSUS

1. Union of India
Through its Secretary,
Department of Personnel & Training,
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension,
North Block, New Delhi
2. Staff Selection Commission,
Through its Chairman,
Block No.12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Colony, New Delhi
3. Staff Selection Commission,
(Northern Region)
Through its Regional Director,
Block No.12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110504
4. Commissioner of Police,
PHQ, MSO Building,
IP Estate, New Delhi
5. The Director,
Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL)
Sector 36-A, Plot No.2, Dhakshin Marg,
Chandigarh (Punjab – 160036)

- Respondents

(By Advocates: Mr. KM Singh and Mr. Amit Anand)

ORDER (Oral)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

Staff Selection Commission (SSC) issued a notification in April, 2017, inviting applications for selection and appointment to the post of Sub Inspectors in Delhi Police. The applicant responded to the same. The procedure involved conducting of written examination and verification of the physical fitness. The results were published on 30.10.2018 and the name of the applicant figured in the list of successful candidates at SI. No. 305.

2. When the issuance of offer of appointment was delayed, the applicant approached the respondents. She was informed in May, 2019 that her dossier has not been forwarded to the User Department, i.e. Delhi Police in view of the pendency of forensic verification of her writing and signature in the answersheets.

3. This OA is filed, challenging the inaction of the respondents. The applicant contends that while all other candidates, who were selected, were issued order of appointment, it is being denied in her case.

4. We heard Mr. Ajesh Luthra, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. KM Singh, learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3 and Mr. Amit Anand, learned counsel for respondent no.4.

5. The record discloses that the applicant was selected and her name was included in the list of successful candidates. From the reply given to the applicant, it is evident that the issuance of offer of appointment to the

applicant is delayed, pending verification of the alleged mismatch of signature writing in the answersheets. Even if that is true, the respondents cannot delay the matter indefinitely. The applicant does have a genuine grievance on account of undue delay.

6. We, therefore, dispose of the OA, directing the respondents to take further steps in pursuance of the selection of the applicant within a period of six weeks from today. We make it clear that if the verification through forensic laboratory is not completed within that time, the feasibility of issuance of offer of appointment, subject to the outcome of analysis by forensic laboratory shall be considered.

Pending MA, if any, stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/lg/