

**IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO 587 OF 2018**

**DISTRICT : SOLAPUR**

Nilesh Ankush Ubale, )  
Occ : Nil, )  
At Post Mahisgaon, Ubale Vasti, )  
Tal – Madha, Dist-Solapur. )...**Applicant**

**Versus**

1. The State of Maharashtra )  
Through its Chief Secretary, )  
Home Department, Mantralaya, )  
Mumbai 400 032. )  
2. The Maharashtra Public Service )  
Commission, through its )  
Chairman, 7 & 8<sup>th</sup> floor, )  
Cooperage Telephone Nigam )  
Bldg, M.K Marg, Cooperage, )  
Mumbai 400 021. )...**Respondents**

Shri S.B Talekar, learned advocate for the Applicant.

Ms Swati Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

**CORAM** : **Shri Justice A.H Joshi (Chairman)**  
**Shri P.N Dixit (Member) (A)**

**RESERVED ON** : **20.12.2018**

**PRONOUNCED ON** : **04.01.2019**

**PER** : **Shri Justice A.H Joshi (Chairman)**

**ORDER**

1. Heard Shri S.B Talekar, learned advocate for the Applicant and Ms Swati Manchekar, learned Chief Presenting Officer for the Respondents

2. Facts of the case are as follows:-

(a) Respondent no. 2 issued advertisement in order to fill up total 750 posts of Police Sub-Inspector subject to the fulfilment of terms and conditions as mentioned therein.

(b) The applicant applied for the post of Police Sub-Inspector from Sport category pursuant to the advertisement.

3. As applicant's candidature is declined, he has approached this Tribunal.

4. Applicant has approached this Tribunal with following prayers:-

VIII Prayers:

(A) To quash and set aside category wise details, number of posts advertised recommended candidates published on 20.6.2018 by the M.P.S.C, Mumbai (Exh. 'J')

(B) To direct the Respondents to include the name of the applicant in the list of candidates eligible for recommendation dated 20.6.2018, published by the M.P.S.C and to appoint him as P.S.I from Open-Sports category pursuant to the PSI Main Examination-2016.

(C) To direct the Respondents to appoint the applicant as PSI pursuant to the PSI Main Examination-2016.

5. Applicant's claim and contentions contained in the O.A are as follows:-

(a) Applicant participated in 10<sup>th</sup> Senior National Men-Women Fencing National Championship held at Lucknow in August, 1998 and secured third position in the event.

- (b) He applied for validation of Sports Certificate on 03.05.2017.
- (c) The advertisement for recruitment to the post of Police Sub-Inspector was issued by Respondent no. 2 on 17.5.2017.
- (d) The last date for submitting application is 1.6.2017.
- (e) The applicant received Validation Certificate on 8.11.2017.

6. The crucial pleadings contained in the Original Application are seen in grounds 39-A to 39-D.

“36-A. The applicant submits that the Respondent no. 2 issued a communication dated 4.7.2018 holding that the applicant is ineligible for appointment to the post of Police Sub-Inspector on the ground that the applicant failed to comply with the provisions of the Government Resolution dated 1.7.2016 as he got his Sports Certificate verified after the last date of the application for the Police Sub-Inspector Main Examination, 2017, i.e. after 1.6.2017.

36-B The applicant submits that as per clause 3.6 of the advertisement dated 7.12.2016 for the PSI Preliminary Examination-2016, the candidates were required to apply for Sports verification certificate immediately after filling in the application form. Accordingly the applicant applied for the Sports Verification Certificate on 3.5.2015.

36-C The applicant submits that it is for the first time was brought within the knowledge of the applicant vide Advertisement dated 17.5.2017 for the PSI Main Examination that the applicant is required to have the Sports Certificate verified before 1.6.2017. The applicant though had applied for verification of the Sports certificate before the prescribed date, the same was not issued by the Deputy Director of Sports and Youth Services.

39-D. The applicant submits that the delay in issuance of the Verification Certificate is on the part of the Deputy Director of Sports and Youth Services, who took almost four months to verify the certificate and issued the same on 8.11.2017. In any case, the delay, if any, is not attributable to the applicant. The applicant had not slept over his duties, and as such, the applicant cannot be put at loss for an omission on part of the Deputy Director of Sports and Youth Services, Pune.

7. Respondents have not filed affidavit in reply.

8. The question which arises for consideration in the present O.A are as follows:-

Question No. (1). Whether conditions contained in clause 4(v) of Government decision dated 1.7.2016 and requiring that candidate must obtain the Validation Certificate of participating in Sports before the last date fixed for nomination, results in denial of opportunity of being a candidate for public employment?

Question No. (2). On facts, has the applicant made out a case of his eligibility on account of failure to possess validation, delay in grant whereof is not attributable to him.

9. In the background that applicant had applied well in time but was awarded the validity certificate 190 days from his applying, applicant cannot be faulted for his inability to get the validation certificate.

10. On the facts of the case, it is not shown that the delay in issuance of the validity in the present case was on account of any fault on the part of the applicant.

11. Finding on Questions:-

Question No. (1). Whether conditions contained in clause 4(v) of Government decision dated 1.7.2016 and requiring that candidate must obtain the Validation Certificate of participating in Sports before the last date fixed for nomination, results in denial of opportunity of being a candidate for public employment?

Findings : (a) In so far as first question is concerned, this Tribunal has decided O.A 610/2017 and held that imposition of a condition, compliance whereof is exclusively within the domain of the executive and is beyond the control of candidate cannot be made a hurdle in the way of a individual of becoming a candidate for public employment.

(b) Denial of candidature to a citizen in the matter of public employment on account of failure to comply with a condition which is beyond his physical control, human limits and is a matter of authority and domain of public authorities, can never be imposed. Imposition of such condition result in violation of fundamental Rights of equal opportunity of consideration in the matter of public employment, is utter violation of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India.

(c) This Tribunal holds for the reasons recorded in O.A 610/2017 and O. A. 204 of 2018 decided on 19.11.2018 that the imposition of condition of possession of certificate by a candidate before the last date fixed for making application cannot apply to the candidates whose claim for verification or vetting of the Sports Certificate is pending before the authorities and the candidate is not responsible for

the delay and the blame is not attributable to the candidate.

(d) In view of the said discussion and findings, Question No. 1 is answered against the authorities and in favour of the Government.

(e) Therefore, applicant is held entitled for consideration of his claim on his own merit and in accordance with the recruitment rules.

Question No. (2) On facts, has the applicant made out a case of his eligibility on account of failure to possess validation, delay in grant whereof is not attributable to him.

Findings : The details as to how the applicant had participated, his Certificate had been validated and Respondent no. 2 took more than two months' time are admitted facts.

12. In the result, O.A is allowed in following terms:-

- (a) Clause 4(v) of Government decision dated 1.7.2016 shall not apply to applicant's candidature for his claim being considered.
- (b) Applicant's candidature be considered on the basis of validity certificate received by him on 8.11.2017, which is on record of O.A, at Exh. I, pages 69-70.
- (c) Applicant's candidature be considered on its own merit and Respondent shall grant to him due placement in the provisional and final merit list in accordance with the Recruitment Rules and all consequential benefits according to his entitlement as regards his eligibility as to appointment according to his merit and as per the rules and procedure of recruitment, except impugned para/ Rule 4(v) contained in Govt. Decision dated 1.7.2016.

- (d) In the facts and circumstances of the case, parties are directed to bear their own costs.

**Sd/-  
(P.N Dixit)  
Member (A)**

**Sd/-  
(A.H. Joshi, J.)  
Chairman**

**Place : Mumbai  
Date : 04.01.2019  
Dictation taken by : A.K. Nair.**