

W.P.C.T. 86 of 2024

**Sri Rameswar Prasad Singh
Vs.
Union of India & Ors.**

Mr. Manotosh Chakraborty,
Mr. Sudhir Kr. Bhowmik
...for the Petitioner

Mr. Pulakesh Bajpayee,
...for the Respondents

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.
2. Pursuant to an Employment Notice issued on 25.09.2006 for filling up post of a specified category in Group-D under the Eastern Railway, the petitioner applied. The final panel was published on 11.08.2012 and was operated during the currency of its life. The panel expired on 10.08.2014. The O.A. has been filed in the year 2018 seeking a direction upon the authorities to forward the documents relating to appointment for fresh verification. The petitioner has sought consequential directions for consideration of his candidature on merit.
3. The brief factual background is that in view of the large number of applicants, the authorities had processed the various applications including the petitioner's application, but subject to a detailed verification at a later stage. During the course of

verification the Forensic Document Examiner found a mismatch in the handwriting sample in the application (PDS) & Declaration Form with the petitioner's signature/handwriting in the OMR sheet and attendance sheet of the written examination.

4. It is apparent from the records that the issue was contested by the petitioner and opportunity was given to the petitioner to take his stand on the issue pursuant to orders passed in W.P.C.T. No. 467 of 2012 on 05.06.2013. In the reply filed before the Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as the 'C.A.T.') respondents have specifically averred that the applicant did not turn up in response to the show-cause regarding rejection of his candidature.
5. In the rejoinder, the petitioner who was the applicant before the C.A.T. has given a one line bald and evasive denial. There is no material to show that pursuant to the show-cause notice fixing the date on 09.11.2017 before the authorities, the petitioner had appeared or made any response thereto. It is clear from the records that he did not avail the opportunity, when it was granted in the year 2017.
6. Under the circumstances, the C.A.T. has dismissed the O.A. filed by the petitioner on the

ground that the claim now is belated; and long after expiry of the panel on 10.08.2014.

7. Considering the above facts and circumstances apparent from the record, we do not find any infirmity in the decision of the C.A.T. dated 31.08.2023 passed in O.A. No. 388 of 2018. The order does not require any interference in exercise of extraordinary, discretionary writ jurisdiction.
8. The Writ Petition being **W.P.C.T. 86 of 2024** is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)