



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**O.A. No. 296/2025 With M.A No. 4724/2025,
M.A No. 296/2025, M.A No. 297/2025 and
M.A No. 3709/2025**

Reserved on : 04.11.2025

Pronounced on : 12.11.2025

Hon'ble Mrs. Harvinder Kaur Oberoi, Member (J)
Hon'ble Dr. Sumeet Jerath, Member (A)

1. Niranjan Kumar
Aged about 26 yrs
S/o Jamiri Lal
R/o 53 A Gali no. 2, West Sagar Pur
Southwest Delhi 110046.
 2. Babloo
Aged about 24 yrs
S/o Dhani Mahto
R/o C 681 Metro Vihar, Holambi Kalan,
North West Delhi
Delhi-110082.
 3. Manish Kumar
Aged about 20 yrs
S/o Hariom Singh
R/o Bhaipur, Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh, 203141
 4. Rajesh Kumar
Aged about 32 yrs
S/o Sherpal Singh
R/o Bhaipur, Bulandshahr, UP, 203141
- ...Applicants

(By Advocate : Mr. Shrikant Prasad and Mr. Aryan Kumar)

VERSUS

1. UNION OF INDIA
Through Secretary
Ministry of Railways
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi. 110001

Item 5 (C-3)



2. UNION OF INDIA
Through, Secretary
Railway Recruitment Board,
Ministry of Railways
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi 110001
 3. RAILWAY RECRUITMENT BOARD
Executive Director Establishment (RRB),
Railway Board
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi. 110001
 4. RAILWAY RECRUITMENT CELL,
NORTHERN RAILWAY
Through General Manager
Block C. Lajpat Nagar I, Lajpat Nagar,
New Delhi, Delhi 110024
 5. UNION OF INDIA
Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship
Through, Secretary, Shram Shakti Bhawan,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001
-Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. R. V. Sinha, Mr. A. S. Singh, Mr. Ashish Singh, Ms. Shriya Sharma, Ms. Jyoti Garg, Mr. Akshit Pradhan with Ms. Muskan Goyal and Mr. Vikash Chaurasia CLA, NRHQ)

ORDER

Hon'ble Dr. Sumeet Jerath, Member (A):

M.A No. 296/2025 :-

The instant M.A for joining together of parties in a single OA is allowed as all the applicants have a common cause of action and are seeking similar reliefs.

O.A No. 296/2025 :-

The instant OA has been filed by Shri Niranjana Kumar and three other applicants – Babloo, Manish Kumar and Rajesh Kumar under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the

following reliefs:-



"1. To quash Annexure A of CEN 08/2024 Dated 21.01.2025 Attached as A1. issued by the Railway Recruitment Board, which revised the minimum educational qualifications for Level-1 recruitment without adequate publicity, creating unfair competition.

2. Direct the Respondents to proceed with CEN 08/2024-recruitment using the earlier prescribed qualifications of 10th pass plus ITI or NAC, as consistently communicated since 2018 and justified in Letter No. E(NG)II/2018/RR-I/13 dated 25.09.2018, emphasizing the need for technical proficiency.

3. Grant any other relief deemed appropriate in the interests of justice."

2. The factual matrix of the case as per the counsel of the applicants is that the applicants are aspirants for various posts in Level 1 of 7th CPC Pay Matrix in the Railways who are aggrieved by the sudden revision in the minimum qualification requirements for Level-1 posts in Railways vide Circular No. CEN 08/2024. They are challenging the same. According to the counsel of the applicants between the period from 2018 to 2024 various circulars had been issued by the Railways specifying the minimum educational qualifications as 10th pass + ITI. However, by way of Annexure A, the minimum educational qualification had been reduced to 10th Pass or ITI or equivalent or NAC which has significantly widened the eligibility criteria thereby affecting approximately 39,20,067 candidates who prepared themselves as per the earlier qualifications. The abrupt change also undermines the principles of transparency and the legitimate



expectations of the aspirants. Moreover, it creates an environment of increased competition by allowing just 10th Pass candidates to participate in the examination. Aggrieved, they have chosen to file the present OA.

3. The counsel of the applicants argued vociferously using the following grounds :-

"1. Based on the repeated and consistent communications from the Railway Ministry over several years, including a clear and unambiguous direction to prepare for exams with qualifications of 10th pass ITI or NAC, thousands of aspirants, including the Petitioners, invested considerable time, effort, and financial resources to complete their ITI courses or obtain their NAC certificates.

2. That thousands of aspirants have invested considerable time, resources, and effort in pursuing ITI courses since 2019, based on the continuous conduct of railways and repeated intimation regarding the eligibility criteria.

3. Candidates were under the reasonable belief that the qualifications set by the Ministry for Level-1 recruitment would remain static, and they specifically tailored their educational and career plans accordingly.

4. This sudden deviation from the long-standing criteria lacks adequate publicity and goes against the legitimate expectations of Around 39 Lakhs 20 Thousands sixty seven (39,20,067) No of aspirants who prepared themselves as per the earlier qualifications.

5. During 2019 Onwards till date a RTI No DEGOT/R/E/24/00688 shows that around 39 lakhs students have undergone ITI Courses since 2019."

4. During the course of hearing the counsel of the applicants handed across the Bar the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Tej**



Prakash Pathak and others vs. Rajasthan High Court and others, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3184 wherein the Hon'ble Court held the following :-

"12. To effectively analyse and adjudicate upon the questions referred, we would divide our discussion into following parts:

(a) When the recruitment process commences and comes to an end;

(b) Basis of the doctrine that 'rules of the game' must not be changed during the course of the game, or after the game is played;

(c) Whether the decision in K. Manjusree (supra) is at variance with earlier precedents on the subject;

(d) Whether the above doctrine applies with equal strictness qua method or procedure for selection as it does qua eligibility criteria;

(e) Whether procedure for selection stipulated by Act or Rules framed either under the proviso to Article 309/10 of the Constitution or a Statute could be given a go-bye;

(f) Whether appointment could be denied by change in the eligibility criteria after the game is played.

13 The process of recruitment begins with the issuance of advertisement and ends with the filling up of notified vacancies. It consists of various steps like inviting applications, scrutiny of applications, rejection of defective applications or elimination of ineligible candidates, conducting examinations, calling for interview or viva voce and preparation of list of successful candidates for appointment.

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

15. The principle of fairness in action requires that public authorities be held accountable for their representations. Good administration requires public authorities to act in a predictable manner and honour the promises made or practices established unless there is good reason not to do so.

16. Candidates participating in a recruitment process have legitimate expectation that the process of selection will be fair and non-arbitrary. The basis of doctrine of legitimate mentioned in clause (4) in addition to the existing reservation and subject to a maximum of 10% of the posts



in each category, expectation in public law is founded on the principles of fairness and non-arbitrariness in government dealings with individuals. It recognises that a public authority's promise or past conduct will give rise to a legitimate expectation. This doctrine is premised on the notion that public authorities, while performing their public duties, ought to honour their promises or past practices. The legitimacy of an expectation can be inferred if it is rooted in law, custom, or established procedure, 22 However, the doctrine of legitimate expectation does not impede or hinder the power of the public authorities to lay down a policy or withdraw it. The public authority has the discretion to exercise the full range of choices available within its executive power. The public authority often has to take into consideration diverse factors, concerns, and interests before arriving at a particular policy decision. The courts are generally cautious in Interfering with a bona fide decision of public authorities which denies legitimate expectation provided such a decision is taken in the larger public interest. Thus, public interest serves as a limitation on the application of the doctrine of legitimate expectation. Courts have to determine whether the public interest is compelling and sufficient to outweigh the legitimate expectation of the claimant. While performing a balancing exercise, courts have to often grapple with the issues of burden and standard of proof required to dislodge the claim of legitimate expectation."

5. This matter was heard by the Tribunal on 14.02.2025 and the following order was passed which *inter alia* states as under :-

"6. We have heard the rival submissions and perused the documents on record.

7. The nature of the present OA is like that of a PIL. The applicants are otherwise qualified and they have not been ousted from the recruitment exercise. They are free to participate, however, by way of the OA they are seeking relief to stop other candidates from participating in the recruitment exercise.

8. In our view, the respondents have been able to show that the power to make the rules lies in the hands of the respondents as per their administrative requirements. So it is not our mandate to go behind the policy decision taken by the respondents. Further, in our view no individual rights of the applicants have been infringed upon. Accordingly, the interim prayer as set forth in Para 9 of the OA is rejected.

9. List this OA for completion of pleadings on 28.03.2025."



6. Subsequently, this matter was heard by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP(C) No. 2771/2025 and an order was passed on 05.03.2024 and then on 06.03.2025.

7. Later, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP(C) No. 2771/2025 passed another order on 28.07.2025 stating the following:-

"4. In view of the above, we dispose of this writ petition by directing that the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondents shall continue to operate during the pendency of the O.A. before the learned Tribunal.

5. We direct that the O.A. be listed before the learned Tribunal on 18th August, 2025. The parties shall appear before the learned Tribunal on the said date.

6. We are informed that the pleadings in the O.A. are complete. We request the learned Tribunal to adjudicate the O.A., preferably within a month of its first listing.

7. We make it clear that the O.A. shall be determined on its own merits, remaining uninfluenced by any orders passed by this Court in the present writ petition.

8. The pending applications are also disposed of as having been rendered infructuous."

8. In the light of the above order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, this Tribunal has heard the matter again. The counsel of the applicants has reiterated the grounds already mentioned and quoted the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Tej Prakash Pathak vs. Rajasthan High Court** (supra).

9. Per contra, the counsel of the respondents has argued vociferously on (i) Technical grounds and (ii) Merits of the case.



On technical grounds, the counsel of the applicants has stated from his counter affidavit that :-

“(i) The present application is in the nature of a PIL and the applicants have no *locus standi* to challenge the fixation of eligibility criteria by the respondents, which is in the exclusive domain of the employer as decided by the Hon'ble Courts in catena of judgements.

(ii) The applicants have challenged the CEN 08/2025 dated 21.01.2025 which appears to be not in existence. It is submitted that in prayer clause the applicant has referred Annexure-A-1 as Advertisement No.08/2024 publication of which is dated 22.1.2025 and the same is in consonance with the modified eligibility condition notified on 2.1.2025.

(iii) The applicants are relying upon policy/recruitment rules which have already been superseded in terms of the RBE 1/2025 dated 2.1.2025 (Annexure-R-1) and therefore, they ceased to be in existence. It is also trite law that it is for the employer to lay down the conditions of service and recruitment rules and a candidate can only refer to and rely upon the rules in existence and does not have any right to claim that a particular rule should be framed as per its convenience and to make such candidate eligible and to enable the candidate to appear in the competitive examination. It is stated



that even the persons in the employment do not have any right to claim a particular recruitment rule or service rule to suit them.

(iv) That merely because the rules of examination or recruitment rules will enhance the competition between the eligible candidates cannot be a ground to challenge either the rules or rules of examination since the employer has a right to select the best and meritorious person(s) and the eligible person has a right to appear in such recruitment process and compete in the process on merit.”

Also the counsel of the respondents pointed out that the applicants have not properly signed in the affidavit and the same has also not been properly verified. Moreover, none of the four applicants in the instant OA – Niranjana Kumar, Babloo, Manish Kumar and Rajesh Kumar gave a representation to the respondents ventilating their grievances and have now approached the Tribunal without exhausting all the legal remedies. The representations filed before the respondents have been signed as Gaurav, Anil Kumar Pandey and Abhishek Kumar who are not the applicants in the present OA. The counsel argued that by misrepresenting the facts, the applicants are trying to perpetuate fraud on the Tribunal.

10. During the course of hearing, the counsel of the respondents handed across the Bar the following catena of judgments as also the written submissions :-

Item 5 (C-3)



1. **Manohar Lal (Dead) by LRs vs. Ugrasen (Dead) by LRs & Ors**, (2010) 11 SCC 557;
2. **Bachhaj Nahar vs. Nilima Mandal & Anr**, (2008) 17 SCC 491;
3. **Ranu Hazarika & Ors. vs. State of Assam & Ors**, (2011) 4 SCC 798;
4. **Union of India vs. E.I.D. Parry (India) Ltd.**, (2000) 2 SCC 223;
5. **Nagaland Senior Government Employees Welfare Association & Ors. vs. State of Nagaland & Ors**, (2010) 7 SCC 643;
6. **Mallikarjuna Rao & Ors. vs. State of Andhra Pradesh Ors**, (1990) 2 SCC 707;
7. **Nirmala Vincent vs. Union of India & Ors**, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 3812;
8. **Maharashtra Public Service Commission through its Secretary vs. Sandeep Shriram Warade & Ors**, (2019) 6 SCC 362;
9. **Union of India & Ors. vs. Kali Dass Batish & Anr**, (2006) 1 SCC 779;
10. **Anand Yadav & Ors. vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors**, (2021) 12 SCC 390;
11. **Bedanga Talukdar vs. Saifudaullah Khan & Ors**, (2011) 12 SCC 85;
12. **State of Tamil Nadu & Ors vs. G. Hemlathaa & Anr**, (2020) 19 SCC 430;
13. **Sudhir Kumar Consul vs. Allahabad Bank**, (2011) 3 SCC 486;
14. **Tej Prakash Pathak & Ors. vs. Rajasthan High Court & Ors**, (2025) 2 SCC 1;
15. **Amrit Yadav vs. The State of Jharkhand & Ors.**, - 2025 SCC Online SC 280;
16. **Rachna & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.** - (2021) 5 SCC 638;
17. **State of Orissa & Ors. vs. Harapriya Bisoi**, -(2009) 12 SCC 378 ;
18. **Bharat Petroleum Corp. Ltd. vs. N. R. Vairamani** – (2004) 8 SCC 679 and

In the written submissions the respondents have stated as under :-

"2. The application is in the nature of PIL and the same is not maintainable.

3. It is trite that even the selectee does not have right of appointment and a candidate has right to compete in the



process of selection/recruitment as per the RRs/advertisement and nothing more. Reliance is placed on "Union of India & Ors Vs Kali Das Batish", reported as (2006) 1 SCC 779.

4. The application is based on misrepresentation amounting to fraud on behalf of the applicants in as much as they have made frivolous submissions in the form of declaration under para 6 of the OA referring to Annexure-A-10 (at pages 42 to 48 of OA) and with reference to the representation it is evident that the representations are in the context of different persons, not party to the OA. Likewise, at page 3 of List of Events, the applicants contend that the respondents issued impugned letter revising the minimum qualification but the same is not impugned and contended that it was not in their knowledge. It is submitted that the application has duly been verified under affidavit and for this lapse, the application deserves to be dismissed in limine. Reliance is placed on "State of Orissa & Ors Vs Harapriya Bisoi", reported as (2009) 12 SCC 378, para 40.

5. The application is not an application on behalf of applicants in law in as much as the same has not been verified in terms of Form-I Appendix-A of CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987, as required under Rule 4 thereof. It is trite that if the statutory rule or law requires to do something in a particular manner, the same should be done in that manner only. Other modes of its performance are prohibited. Refer: "A.R. Antulay Vs Ramdas Srinivas Nayak & Anr.", reported as (1984) 2 SCC 500, para 22.

6. It may be noted that in addition to the aforesaid, there is no proof of any authorization placed on record by the first applicant that he has been authorized by other co-applicants. Even otherwise, the affidavit in support of the contention stated to have been filed that he has been authorized to file and sign on behalf of the other applicants is not attested in terms of law. Therefore, there is no valid authorization also. It is pertinent to note that Chapter XIV Rule 83 of the CAT (Rules of Practice), 1993 prescribes the persons authorized to attest the affidavit and the claimed affidavit is not duly attested, though identified. It is submitted that identification of a person by someone as deponent and attestation by the authority of the affidavit, both are different.

7. In addition to the aforesaid that there is no application in law or application seeking joining of application in law, there is no pleadings at all as would be seen that the application does not deal with the particulars of the applicants, like their eligibility, qualification in the OA nor does it contain any valid and lawful prayer. In absence of the pleadings and attestation, the OA is devoid of merit and deserves to be



dismissed. For relevance of pleadings, the reliance of judgements at serial No.1 to 4 in the list of reliances on behalf of respondents may be referred to. The policy letter dated 2.1.2025 (Annexure-R-1 of the reply) superseded all the referred policy/rules of 2017, 2018, 2019, as referred to and relied upon by the applicants. But the same is not under challenge nor referred to and as such there is no pleading also. The recruitment process started with-issuance of advertisement (Annexure-R-2) vide CEN No.08/2024 on 22.01.2025 but the same is not challenged nor there is any pleadings by way of averments in the body of the plaint.

8. The impugned Annexure-A i.e., CEN 08/2024 dated 21.01.2025 is not in existence.

9. There is presumption of validity of constitutionality of the action and rule and there is limited scope of judicial review of policy decisions/rule by the Court or Tribunal. Refer judgements at serial No.5 to 8 and 17 of list of reliances on behalf of respondents.

10. There is limited scope of judicial review of recruitment process, eligibility criteria and conditions of service and in this case, rule has been made by the competent authority and the case does not follow under the judicially accepted criteria i.e., bias, malafide, etc. Refer judgement at serial No.10 of list of reliances on behalf of respondents.

11. The advertisements are mandatory in nature and have to be strictly complied and the same cannot be interfered with based on sympathy or hardship, etc. Refer judgements at serial No.11 to 13 of list of reliances on behalf of respondents.

12. The impugned notification No.08/2024 (Annexure-A-2 at page 26 of OA) does not bear the date. In fact, the same was issued in the Employment News for the week 28 December to 03 January, 2025 and the same was indicative in nature in a single page for just informing intention of the respondents to hold the examination.

13. The a detailed advertisement was published on 22.01.2025 (Annexure-R-2 at page 9 of the reply) on the website of the respondents as per its policy and that is the only policy based on which the recruitment process has started by issuance thereof on 22.01.2025.

14. The difference between indicative notice and the advertisement has been explained in para 5 of the reply of the respondents under 'Preliminary Objections' and the same may be referred to. What is the valid advertisement and meaning of indicative, please refer to serial No.15 and 16 of list of reliances on behalf of respondents which will clarify that the impugned indicative notice (at page 26 of the OA) was not a valid advertisement.



15. *The candidates do not have any legitimate expectation for appointment except to appear and compete the recruitment process in terms of the mandatory advertisement, instructions and rules. Refer Kali Das Batish (supra) and clarified in Tej Prakash Pathak, paras 22 to 27 (at serial No.14 of list of reliances).*

16. *What is the precedent has been repeatedly clarified by Hon'ble Apex Court in "Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd & Anr Vs N.R. Vairamani & Anr", reported as (2004) 8 SCC 579 and reliance upon the Constitution Bench judgement in Tej Prakash Pathak (supra) on behalf of applicants is misconceived. Rather, the principles therein support the submissions on behalf of the respondents herein."*

11. He further stated that the instant OA is a frivolous application to disrupt and frustrate the recruitment process to Grade I post of the Railways where 1.08 crore candidates had applied. Moreover, by diluting the minimum educational qualifications from Xth pass + ITI or NCA to Xth pass, or the ITI or NCA equivalent, the rights of the applicants have in no way been undermined/violated /adversely impacted. They are eligible to appear in the examination and should prepare to write the Computer Based Test (CBT) and the subsequent steps of Physical Efficiency Test (PET); Document Verification (DV) and Medical Examination (ME) as and when the stage would arrive in future. Their legitimate expectations have in no way been violated as per the ratio given in Hon'ble Apex Court Judgment of **Sankarsan Das vs. UOI** - AIR 1991 SC 1612 wherein it has been ruled that '*merely because the candidates' name appears in the select list, he/she does not get indefeasible right to get appointment*'.



12. The respondents also handed across the Bar a file on which the decision was taken which was endorsed by the Railway Authorities to change the minimum educational qualifications from Xth pass + ITI or NCA to Xth pass.

13. We have heard the rival submissions, examined the documents and records and the rulings cited by both sides. We have observed that this decision to change the minimum educational qualification was being discussed on the file in the Ministry of Railways for quite some time – was an evolutionary and not a revolutionary process and was arrived at after thorough discussion and deliberation; and not in any arbitrary, hasty, discriminatory or unjust way. This is borne by the following noting in the file of the Railways :-

Note # 15

Note # 15

Ref Note # 12

1. With Board's (MS, FC, CRB) approval, the educational qualification for Level-1 (erstwhile Gr-D) intake were enhanced from the existing 10th std. passed or ITI or equivalent or National Apprenticeship Certificate (NC) granted by NCVT, to 10th plus NAC granted by NCVT or 10th pass plus ITI, for the technical departments of Civil Engg, Mech. Engg., Electrical Engg. and Signal & Telecomm in July 2017. For all other departments the minimum educational qualification was retained as unchanged.
2. After this revision in educational qualification, recruitment notification No. CEN-02/2018 was the first such notification issued for Level-1. In the wake of protests from candidates on the issue, the matter was reviewed. It was observed that Level-1 recruitment was being done by the Railways after a gap of more than 4 years and candidates were therefore taken by surprise due to the changes in eligibility conditions (para-3) of Board (MS)'s noting. With Hon'ble MR's approval therefore, specific dispensation was given that 10th pass or ITI/NCVT would continue as the educational



qualifications for both technical and non-technical departments for the current Level-1 notification (No. 02/2018). This was circulated vide RBE No. 31/2018 dated 28.02.2018.

3. Board meeting minutes dated 04.09.2018 recorded that future recruitments to technical departments would only be made with 10th plus ITI. Accordingly, in continuation to Board's letter dated 28.02.2018, it was made clear vide RBE No. 148/2018 dated 25.09.2018 that future recruitments in technical departments in Level-1 would be on the basis of 10th plus ITI/NCVT, as was stipulated in the July 2017 circular referred to in para-1 above.

4. However, this matter was again reviewed in February 2019 w.r.t. CEN RRC-01/2019 wherein it was decided with approval of Hon'ble MR that minimum educational qualification for the forthcoming open market recruitment in Level-1 of pay matrix of 7th CPC in all departments will be same as that for recruitment notification vide CEN 02/2018, i.e. 10th pass OR ITI OR equivalent OR National Apprenticeship Certificate (NAC) granted by NCVT. Notification for the next recruitment in Level-1 of pay matrix of 7th CPC had been issued accordingly vide CEN no. RRC-01/2019 dated 23.02.2019.

5. The issue was considered at the level of Hon'ble MR in May'2019 and following observations were made by the then Hon'ble MR " *We may continue old qualification for this round of recruitment for which process has started & simultaneously widely publicize that for future recruitment the qualification will be changed and let all prospectus applicants before informed to prepare accordingly. Also in regional languages.* " Accordingly, instructions had been issued to all Railways vide letter dated 14.06.2019 that for future recruitments minimum Educational Qualification for future recruitments in Level-1 in technical departments (Board's letter dated 27.07.2017) and catering wing (Board's letter dated 11.12.2017) will be 10th pass plus ITI/NCVT and for non-technical department it would be 10th Pass OR ITI. As desired by the then Hon'ble MR, an Attention Notice mentioning the position/decision had been forwarded to DIP for publishing the same in National English and Hindi dailies. RRCs had also been advised to take action to give wide publicity to the above mentioned position/decision among the public through vernacular newspapers. Publicity was accordingly given by various Railways as seen from feedback received from WCR and SR. A fresh notification for recruitment to Level-1 posts is scheduled to be notified in October-December 2024. As such, the issue for fixing minimum educational qualification is again required to be decided. The issue of minimum qualification for recruitment to Level 1 of technical department has been discussed recently at the apex level it has been felt desirable to keep the educational qualification same as that of CEN RRC- 01/2019.

Accordingly, it is proposed to review the revised educational qualification and retain the



existing educational qualification requirement of "10th pass OR ITI or equivalent OR National Apprenticeship Certificate (NAC) granted by NCVT" for all future open-market recruitments in Level-1 in Railways. Submitted for approval.

AM Staff

DG HR

CRB & CEO

MR

30/09/2024 04:49 PM

Sign

RAVINDRA KUMAR

EDE(N)

Note # 16

30/09/2024 05:54 PM

✓



Digitally Signed PRAMILA HINGORANI BHARGAVA

AM/STAFF

Note # 17

09/10/2024 06:43 PM

✓



Digitally Signed NAVEEN GULATI

DG/HR

Note # 18

Note attached.

3472075.pdf

02/01/2025 11:29 AM

✓



Digitally Signed SATISH KUMAR

CRB



File No. E(NG)II/2024/RR-1/41 (Computer No. 3472075)

30/09/2024 05:54 pm PRAMILA HINGORANI BHARGAVA
AM/STAFF
Digitally Signed

Note # 17

09/10/2024 06:43 pm NAVEEN GULATI
DG/HR
Digitally Signed

CRB & CEO Note #15, marked "A" may
kindly be approved.
1.1.25

MR 1.1.25

DG/HR

5

Generated from eOffice by SATISH KUMAR, CRB & CEO(SK), CRB, CRB Office on 09/10/2024 07:29 pm

Also the rules of the game were not changed mid way as we have observed that the clock started to tick not on 28th December 2024 (Date of indicative notice) but on 22nd January, 2025 (Date of Publication). We have observed that UPSC, Railways etc follow the

Item 5 (C-3)



practice of advance notice to alert the applicants but this in no way signifies that advertisement for recruitment had been issued on the date of indicative notice. For all practical purposes, the date of issue of the recruitment advertisement would be counted as on 22.01.2025 (the date shown as the date of publication). The minimum educational qualification for Grade I posts was changed from Xth pass + ITI or NCA equivalent to Xth pass or ITI or NCA equivalent on 02.01.2025 (before the issue of the advertisement). We are therefore of the considered opinion that the balance of convenience in this case lies with the respondents. The instant OA is devoid of merit; deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

All the pending MAs, if any are also disposed of in the aforesaid manner. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

(Dr. Sumeet Jerath)
Member (A)

(Harvinder Kaur Oberoi)
Member (J)

/Mbt/