

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.03.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE K.K.SASIDHARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN

W.P.No.6438 of 2017

M.Sudurshan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Registrar
Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench, Madras

2.The Secretary
Union Public Service Commission
Dholpur House
Shahjahan Road
New Delhi 110 069

3.The Union of India represented by
The Secretary to Government (Education)
Chief Secretariat
Puducherry 605 001

.... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the 1st respondent in O.A.No.310/172 of 2017 dated 08.02.2017 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Suresh

For Respondents: Mr.Syed Mustafa
Special Government Pleader (P)
for R3

O R D E R

K.K.SASIDHARAN, J.

This writ petition is directed against the order dated 8 February, 2017 in the Original Application in O.A.No.310/00 172 of 2017, challenging the order passed by the Union Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as UPSC), rejecting the request made by the petitioner to amend the application filed earlier on the ground that certain material particulars were omitted to be mentioned.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there was no clear statement in the Notification issued by the UPSC that they would not receive any communication after

filing the application for change or amendment. According to the learned counsel, the petitioner failed to indicate his experience in his application and that was the reason for making an application for amendment of the original application.

3. The UPSC issued Notification on 12 December 2015, calling for applications for appointment to the post of Assistant Professors. The petitioner, pursuant to the Notification, submitted On Line application on 28 February 2016.

4. The petitioner, long after submitting application made a representation to the UPSC and more particularly on 26 October 2016 for amendment of his On Line application, so as to include details of his teaching experience. The representation was rejected by the UPSC by letter dated 21 November, 2016. It was the said letter, which was challenged by the petitioner before the Central Administrative Tribunal.

5. The Notification issued by the UPSC contained a clear statement that all necessary particulars should be incorporated in the On Line application. It is a matter of record that only after the expiry of the cut off date prescribed for making application, the petitioner submitted representation for inclusion of his teaching experience. There is no question of amending the On Line application at a later point of time. If such representations are received, there would be no sanctity to the Notification and selection process. The UPSC in its reply made it very clear that it would not be possible to accept the amendment taking into account the process involved in the matter. The petitioner, ought to have included all the necessary particulars in his On Line application submitted on 28 February 2016. In any case, the representation submitted by the petitioner on 26 October 2016 was rightly rejected by the UPSC.

6. The Central Administrative Tribunal considered the issue raised by the petitioner in the right perspective and rejected his claim. We do not find any error or illegality in the said order warranting interference by exercising the power of judicial review.

7. In the up shot, we dismiss the writ petition. No costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS VIII)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

1.The Registrar
Central Administrative Tribunal
Madras Bench, Madras

2.The Secretary
Union Public Service Commission
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road
New Delhi 110 069

3.The Union of India represented by
The Secretary to Government (Education)
Chief Secretariat
Puducherry 605 001.

W.P.No.6438 of 2017

sk(co)
ss(3/4/2017)



WEB COPY