

Status of Legal Notices as on 07.03. 2014

File No.	Name of the Candidate	Roll No.	Date of dispatch	Examination	Speed Post No.	File No.	Status
1	Sh. Ishwar Sharma represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004510996	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433694 5 IN	3/62/9/2011/Legal/ NWR	He has opted only for Post-C i.e. CRPF and secured only 38 marks, but Cut off marks for reserve list was 67 for CRPF , therefore he didn't get qualify in Merit List, However in the result declared on 1 st Aug 2013 the petitioner has been found selected.
2	Sh. Ravi Kumar represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004512578	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433706 1 IN	3/62/8/2011/Legal/NWR	He has opted only for Post-B i.e. CISF and secured only 43 marks, but Cut off marks for reserve list was 76 for CISF , therefore he didn't get qualifies in Merit List , However in the result declared on 1 st Aug 2013 the petitioner has been found selected.
3	Sh. Manjit Singh represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004000258	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433704 4 IN	2/62/6/2011/Legal/NWR	He has opted only for Post-C i.e. CRPF and secured only 50 marks, but Cut off marks for reserve list was 67 for CRPF , therefore he didn't get qualify in Merit List , However in the result declared on 1 st Aug 2013 the petitioner has been found selected.
4	Sh. Nitan Singh represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004518222	Reply sent to counsel on 09.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433764 5 IN , file is merge in the original writ petition	3/62/5/2011/Legal/NWR	He has opted for Post – ABCD i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF & SSB and secured only 44 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II

					file		was 65 for BSF, 76 for CISF, 67 for CRPF & 62 for SSB and Shri Nitan Singh scored only 44 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List.
5	Sh. Muneesh Kumar	1601504125	Reply sent to counsel on 16.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF 2011	EP-18433869 9 IN	3/62/17/2011/L egal/NWR	He has been selected in Merit List & allotted Rank No. SL/1196 .
6	Sh. Sunil Kumar represented by Sh. Rakesh K. Nagpal	1801003084	Already filed	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	-	3/62/15/2011/L egal/NWR	The reply is already filed on 29/08/2012 and the same has been disposed off on 19 th May 2013.
7	Amit Kumar represented by Sh. Pankaj Sharma Advocate	1402512611	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433696 2 IN	3/62/14/2011/L egal/NWR	He was declared qualify in Selection List under state code 28 i.e. Punjab , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is resident of Himachal Pradesh, therefore in the revised result he was not qualified since he couldn't secured requisite cut off as decided for the state of Himachal Pradesh .
8	Sh. Surinder Kumar represented by Sh. Sukhdev Kamboj, Advocate	1401501451	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433712 9 IN File is merge with the CWP	3/62/8/2011/Le gal/NWR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) He has been selected in Merit List and allotted Rank No. SL/15707 in CISF and the dossier of selected candidates have been forwarded to CISF & appointment letter will be issued by them. 2) After the declaration of the result, at the time of nomination, the candidate was found overage as a general candidate since the Other Backward Certificate submitted by the candidate was not as per the prescribed format hence he could not be treated as a candidate belonging to OBC

							category and his dossier was withheld and he was not nominated for appointment.
9	Sh. Pawan Kumar represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004507596	Reply sent to counsel on 18.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433884 4 IN	3/62/5/2011/Legal/NWR	The candidate (Sh. Pawan Singh, roll no 1004507596) found fit in the review medical examination and considered in the revised result-II and had score only 38 marks in the written examination which is below the cut off marks fixed for the UR candidates in the Reserve List. Therefore, in view of the above observation it could be seen that the candidate could not be able to score the cut off marks fixed for Reserve List for UR candidates and due to that he could not be selected. , However in the result declared on 1 st Aug 2013 the petitioner has been found selected.
10	Sh. Sahil Sharma represented by Saurav Mahajan, Advocate	1004505487	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433701 3 IN	3/62/7/2011/Legal/NWR	He has opted only for Post-C i.e. CRPF and secured only 50 marks, but Cut off marks for reserve list was 67 for CRPF , therefore he didn't get qualify in Merit List , However in the result declared on 1 st Aug 2013 the petitioner has been found selected.
11	Sh. Avinash Kumar Apurw represented by Sh. Dipanker Bhatta	7110100206	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Junior Hindi Translator	EP-18433708 9 IN	6/62/16/2011/Legal/NWR	This office has conducted the Skill Test for the Post of Junior Hindi Translator on 5th August 2012 in Chandigarh and we have Nine Regional offices and they have the mandate to decide the date in consultation with SSC Hqrs. for holding the Skill Test. This office has not conducted the Exam of Senior Hindi Translator on 5th August , therefore the question doesn't arise for depriving the candidate for not allowing to appear him for both the Posts.
12	Mhd. Fakrul	5111500103	Reply sent to counsel	Constable (GD) in CPOs	EP-18433848	3/62/19/2011/Legal/NWR	1) He has not mentioned his Roll No. and without that we are not

	Hussain Babhuiy a represent ed by Gautam Ghosh		on14.01.2013 & again on 15.04.2013	2011	1 IN		able to process the case 2) The candidate belong to SSC (NER) and only they have the facts and data of this candidate
13	Sh. Harmind er Singh represent ed by P.S. Bajwa	Roll no. not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 14.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433851 8 IN	3/62/20/2011/L egal/NWR	Commission has already nominated the candidate to Concerned CPOs. Any objection raised by them regarding the Dogra Certificate is to be sorted out by the candidate himself by producing the requisite Dogra Certificate and now SSC has no role to play as the candidate has been nominated by the Commission.
14	Sh. Satish represent ed by Sh. P.S. Bajwa	Roll no. not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433853 5 IN	3/62/21/2011/L egal/NWR	Commission has already nominated the candidate to Concerned CPOs. Any objection raised by them regarding the Dogra Certificate is to be sorted out by the candidate himself by producing the requisite Dogra Certificate and now SSC has no role to play as the candidate has been nominated by the Commission.
15	Sh. Naveen Kumar represent ed by Surinder Singh Duhan, Advocate	1601509773	Reply sent to counsel on 14.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433847 8 IN	3/62/24/2011/L egal/NWR	He has opted for Post –C i.e. CRPF . He was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and allotted Rank No. RL-II/2460 .
16	Sh. Naresh Kumar represent ed by Sh. Vikas Chaudha ry	1402502648	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433697 6 IN	3/62/22/2011/L egal/NWR	He was declared qualified in Select List under State Code 28 i.e. Punjab , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is resident of Haryana , therefore in the revised result he was not qualified since he couldn't not secured requisite cut off as decided for the State of Haryana .

17	Sh Suresh Kumar represented by Vikas Chaudhary, Advocate	1402529368	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433695 9 IN	3/62/24/2011/Legal/NWR	He was declared qualified in Select List under State Code 28 i.e. Punjab , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is resident of Haryana , therefore in the revised result he was not qualified since he couldn't not secured requisite cut off as decided for the State of Haryana .
18	Sh. Ankush represented by Sh.L.K. Malik	1402524300	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433710 0 IN	3/62/25/2011/Legal/NWR	He was declared qualified in Select List under State Code 28 i.e. Punjab , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is resident of Haryana , therefore in the revised result he was not qualified since he couldn't not secured requisite cut off as decided for the State of Haryana .
19	Sh. Anil Kumar represented by Sh.Chirag Kandu, Advocate	1202000160	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP-18433711 5 IN	3/62/26/2011/Legal/NWR	He has selected and he has been allotted Rank No. SL/2324 in ITBP and the dossier of selected candidates have been forwarded to ITBP & appointment letter will be issued by them.
20	Mohd Taj represented by Mohd. Shaqir Hussain, Advocate	1004503169	Merge with Legal Case	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	File is merge with CWP	3/62/27/2011/Legal/NWR	The matter has been examined and it is found that the candidate did not opted for any category in the category column and due to that he was considered under UR category and in that he has failed to scored the minimum cut off marks needed for final selection.
21	Sh. Indraj Singh represented by	1801500974	Reply sent to counsel on 14.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433850 4 IN	3/62/13/2011/Legal/NWR	He has been Not qualified in Revised Result, since he had secured only 48 marks whereas the cut off marks was 64 for BSF , 77 for CISF , 66 for CRPF , 64 for SSB .

	Sh.Shadi ram Mahara mpur, Advocat e						
22	Sh. Anil Kumar represent ed by Sh.Asho k Yadav, Advocat e	2201506755	Reminder sent to SSC (CR) & SSC (Hqr) , New Delhi & Dy. Inspector General on 03.01.2013 and reply sent to Counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	SSC(CR)- EP- 18433716 3 IN SSC(Hqr) - EP- 18433715 7 IN Dy Inspector- EP- 18433717 7 IN Counsel- EP- 18433714 6 IN File is merge with the CWP	3/62/10/2011/L egal/NWR	Dossier of Sh. Anil Kumar is not yet received. The candidate belongs to Haryana, but he had appeared for the Medical Examination at Hazaribagh , since he has opted for the post state of Bihar and accordingly his dossier should be under the custody of Central Region .
23	Sh. Nitin Kumar represent ed by Sh.Rajes h Kumar Dadwal, Advocat e	1402524023	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP- 18433856 6 IN	3/62/12/2011/L egal/NWR	He has qualified in Revised Result and he has been allotted Rank No. SL/9949 in BSF and the dossier of selected candidates have been forwarded to BSF & appointment letter will be issued by them.
24	Sh. Ram Kumar represent ed by	1202500058	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP- 18433854 9 IN	3/62/11/2011/L egal/NWR	He has been selected in additional list of qualified candidates and allotted Rank No. RL/00795 .

	Sh.Ajay Thakur, Advocate						
25	Sh. Arvind kumar Yadav represented by Sh.Naripesh Vatsal, Advocate	2201503890	Reply sent to counsel on 14.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP-18433849 5 IN	3/62/3/2011/Legal/NWR	PET/PST and Medical is the sole responsibility of the CPOs and Staff Selection Commission has no role in conducting the Review Medical Examination
26	Sh. Lal Singh represented by Sh.Shabad Prasad Verma, Advocate	1402506943	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18431710 1 IN	3/62/2/2011/Legal/NWR	He has been selected and allotted Rank No. SL/25968 in BSF and the dossier of selected candidates have been forwarded to BSF & appointment letter will be issued by them.
27	Sh. Rohtash Kumar represented by Sh.Dilbag Singh Danipur, Advocate	1402508204	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433699 3 IN	3/62/1/2012/Legal/NWR	He was declared qualified in Select List under State Code 28 i.e. Punjab , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is resident of Haryana , therefore in the revised result he was not qualified since he couldn't not secured requisite cut off as decided for the State of Haryana .
29	Sh. Anil Kumar represented by Sh.S.S. Malik, Advocate	1801002378	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP-18433852 1 IN	3/62/29/2012/Legal/NWR	He has been selected in Revised Result and allotted Rank No. SL/806-A .

31	Sh. Mohan Singh represented by Sh. Sanjev Aneja, Advocate	1601003380	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	S.I. in CAPF & ASI in CISF-2012	EP-184338597 IN	3/62/30/2012/Legal/NWR	As per the notice of the examination published in the Employment News Paper it has been clearly mentioned that if any candidate doesn't receive Admission Certificate for any stage of the examination or is unable to download the Admit Card from the Website of the Regional Office of the commission where the candidate has applied then the candidate should immediately contact the concerned Regional Office of the Commission with proof of having submitted his application at least one week before the date of the stage of the examination, but the candidate failed to comply the instruction contained in the Employment News and due to that he couldn't appear in the examination.
32	Sh. Harth Kumar represented by Sh. Sat Paul Sharma, Advocate	1601501757	Reply sent to counsel on 31.10.2012	Combined Graduate Level	EP184324292 IN	3/62/31/2012/Legal/NWR	He was allotted Ticket No. 1003363 & his centre was Govt. Model Sr. Sec. School, Sector-44 B, Chandigarh and the same was intimated in his call letter which was send by post, further it is also a fact that the candidate was issued Ticket No. 10023712 but that was not sent by post and for only one day it was uploaded on the website and next day it was removed & an important message was uploaded on the website that such candidate those who had downloaded the Card which has now been uploaded should be downloaded for taking the Exam. There were around 5,000 candidates who took the examination on 16th Sep 2012 in (NWR) Region and all have already followed the instruction given on the website and they all had appeared in the examination with the fresh Ticket No.
33	Sh. Amande	1402520610	Reply sent to counsel on	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433707	3/62/42/2011/Legal/NWR	He has not opted for any Post – ABCD i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF & SSB and

	ep Singh represented by Sh.Arvin d Kashyap, Advocate		03.01.2013		5 IN		secured only 34 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II was <u>60 for BSF, 72 for CISF, 61 for CRPF & 58 for SSB</u> and Shri Amandeep Singh scored only 34 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List .
34	Sh. Vipin represented by Sh.Arvin d Kashyap, Advocate	1402520353	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433702 7 IN	3/62/43/2011/L egal/NWR	He has opted for Post – ABCD i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF & SSB and secured only 49 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II was <u>65 for BSF, 76 for CISF, 67 for CRPF & 62 for SSB</u> and Shri Vipin scored only 49 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List.
35	Sh. Ravinder Singh represented by Sh.Opinder Kumar Thakur, Advocate	1601509818	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433705 8 IN	3/62/33/2012/L egal/NWR	He has opted for Post – ABCD i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF & SSB and secured only 36 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II was <u>65 for BSF, 76 for CISF, 67 for CRPF & 62 for SSB</u> and Shri Ravinder Singh scored only 36 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List .
36	Sh. Vikram represent	1601001244	Reply sent to counsel on 16.01.2013	S.I. on CPOs & ASI in CISF-2011	EP-18433868 5 IN	3/62/41/2012/L egal/NWR	The matter has been taken up with the Staff Selection Commission, Hqrs. New Delhi and the reply has not been

	ed by Sh.Durga Prasad, Advocat e						received in this office. The decision of the SSC Hqrs , will be intimated as & when received. We have received the revise result and the petitioner has been qualified for ITBP and the dossier is also sent to ITBP.
37	Sh. Sohan Singh represent ed by Sh.Sat Pal Anand, Advocat e	1601504507	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP- 18433860 6 IN	3/62/34/2012/L egal/NWR	He has opted for Post – ABCDEF i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF, SSB, ITBP & Assam Rifles and secured only 51 marks, but the cut off marks was <u>63 for CISE, 57 for CRPE, 59 for SSB, 54 for ITBP & 55 for Assam Rifles</u> , therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List.
38	Sh. Ranjit Singh represent ed by Sh.Aman deep Singh Cheema, Advocat e	1401501557	Reply sent to counsel on 09.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP- 18433762 8 IN	3/62/35/2012/L egal/NWR	The candidate had scored only 57 marks in the written examination which is below the cut off marks fixed for the SC candidates in the Reserve List and the marks scored by Sh. Ranjit Singh which is less than the lowest marks scored by the SC candidates is 81 (BSF), 77(CRPF), 72 (ITBP), 71 (SSB) .
39	Sh Mandeep Singh represent ed by Sh.Arvin d Kashyap, Advocat e	1601511137	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP- 18433703 5 IN	3/62/38/2012/L egal/Notice	He has opted for Post – ABCD i.e. BSF, CISF, CRPF & SSB and secured only 51 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II was <u>65 for BSE, 76 for CISF, 67 for CRPF & 62 for SSB</u> and Shri Mandeep Singh scored only 51 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List .

40	Sh. Sanjay represented by Sh. Harshdeep Singh, Advocate	1601000561	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Stenographer "C" & "D"	EP-184338610 IN	3/62/37/2012/Legal/NWR	As per the notice of the examination published in the Employment News Paper it has been clearly mentioned that if any candidate doesn't receive Admission Certificate for any stage of the examination or is unable to download the Admit Card from the Website of the Regional Office of the commission where the candidate has applied and the candidate immediately contact the concerned Regional Office of the Commission with proof of having submitted his application at least one week before the date of the stage of the examination. Since the candidate failed to comply the instruction contained in the Employment News he couldn't appear in the examination.
41	Sh. Mukesh Kumar Meena represented by Sh. Yogesh Sharma, Advocate	1202501267	Reply already sent by ITBP	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	-	3/62/41/2012/Legal/NWR	The matter is already over and we had informed the reason for rejecting the application form .
42	Sh. Daljeet Singh represented by Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate	1004524010	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-184337092 IN	3/62/36/2012/Legal/NWR	He has selected and he has been allotted Rank No. SL/31053 in CISF and the dossier of selected candidates have been forwarded to CISF & appointment letter will be issued by them.
43	Sh. Ashok Kumar	Not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP-184338583 IN	3/62/39/2012/Legal/NWR	The roll no. of the candidate is not mentioned and without that we are not able to locate his file, whether he

	represented by Sh.Ashok Yadav, Advocate				File not found		belongs to NWR or to some other Region , therefore you are requested to kindly mention the Roll No. of the candidate to enable this office to take further action accordingly.
44	Sh.. Rahul Kumar represented by Sh.Arvin d Kashyap, Advocate	1402514261	Reply sent to counsel on 03.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433707 5 IN	3/62/44/2011/L egal/NWR	He has opted only for Post -A i.e. BSF and secured only 53 marks and he was Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination and all candidates those were found Medically Fit in the Review Medical Examination were considered in the Reserve list-II and cut off marks for Reserve List-II was 60 for BSF and Shri Rahul Kumar scored only 53 marks, therefore he didn't get qualify in the Merit List.
45	Sh. Sohan Singh represented by Sh.Sat Pal Anand, Advocate	1601504507	Reply sent to counsel on 16.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP-18433879 5 IN	3/62/45/2012/L egal/NWR	He has secured only 56 marks but the cut off marks for select list was 59 for BSF & 56 for SSB and in BSF it is a tie break case and sorted out as per the notice of the examination and due to that the candidate isn't selected
46	Sh. Inder Dev represented by Sh. S.P. Parmar, Advocate	1202505093	Reply sent to counsel on 16.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-18433870 8 IN	3/62/46/2012/L egal/NWR	He has opted for Post – AD i.e. BSF & SSB and secured only 56 marks but the cut off marks for select list was 59 for BSF & 56 for SSB and in BSF it is a tie break case and sorted out as per the notice of the examination and due to that the candidate isn't selected, further the matter is referred to SSC (Hqr.) to know the reason for his non selection.
47	Sh. Malkit Singh	Roll no. not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 09.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP-18433757 4 IN	3/62/47/2012/L egal/NWR	The candidate is qualified in the written test and as well as in the Medical Examination, but the information

	represented by Sh.Harpal Singh Taragarh, Advocate						regarding his roll no./ticket no. didn't furnished in this notice, so we are unable to provide any kind of information from us then he has to provide us roll no./ticket no.. Further the result is already been declared on 17.10.2012 & 19.11.2012 and available on website .
48	Sh. Ajay Saini represented by Sh. Pawan Sharma, Advocate	1801500245	Reply sent to counsel on 31.12.2012	Constable (GD) in ITBPF 2011	EP184336830IN	3/62/48/2012/Legal/NWR	The name of the candidate figures in the additional list of the candidate called for the medical examination. The detail medical examination was conducted by the ITBP and document were verified by them only and on the basis of the verified data sent by the ITBP the result were processed by the SSC Hqrs, Delhi and regional office was not involved in document verification and prima facie it seems that candidate was considered as UR candidate and the cut off marks for Reserve List-II was 48 for UR & 39 for OBC and the candidate had secured only 46 , therefore he was not considered for selection.
49	Sh. Pulkit Sharma represented by Sh.Neera j Ghosh, Advocate	Roll no. not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBPF-2011	EP-184338552 IN	3/62/49/2012/Legal/NWR	He has not mentioned his Roll No. and without that we are not able to process the case, therefore you are requested to kindly mentioned the Roll No. of the candidate to enable this office to take further action accordingly.
50	Inder Dev represented by Sh. S.P. Parmar, Advocate	Roll no. not mentioned	Reply sent to counsel on 15.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2011	EP-184338570 IN	3/62/50/2013/Legal/NWR	He has not mentioned his Roll No. and without that we are not able to process the case, therefore you are requested to kindly mentioned the Roll No. of the candidate to enable this office to take further action accordingly.

51	Sandeep Singh represented by Sh.Dinesh Kumar Chaudhary, Advocate	1402519854	Reply sent to Counsel & Candidate on 19.01.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP-18433893 2 IN & EP-18433892 9 IN	3/62/51/2012/Legal/NWR	He has declared qualified in Select List , but at the later stage while during the scrutiny of the documents it was found that the candidate is over age, because the candidate belongs to UR category and as per the notice of examination maximum age limit for UR category is 23 yrs as on 01.08.2012 , but the age of the candidate on the crucial date is 23 yrs 03 months 21 days , hence he is over age.
52	Sh. Ram Krishan represented by Sh.Survir Mahajan, Advocate	1402529004	Reply sent to Counsel on 6.02.2012	Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012	EP-18434022 0 IN	3/62/52/2012/Legal/NWR	The matter is being referred to Head Quarter for consideration of his case and due to error in the Data Entry he has been shown as UNFIT . After the case considering by the SSC, Head Quarter the same shall be intimated to you in due course.
53	Ms Minakshi Panwar represented by Sh. Chandan Nayyar, Advocate	1801500175	Matter has been referred to HQ on 21.02.2013	Combine Graduate Level Examination-2011	EP102696 122 IN	3/62/53/2012/Legal/NWR	Counsel has raised the issue of the non selection of the candidate. It seems that the candidate didn't submitted the detailed options for the post and state preference and due to that in verify data the blank option was sent by this office and may be due to that she was not considered for selection in spite of scoring very good marks.
54	Amit Sharma represented by Sh.Neeru Charak, Advocate	1004516612	Reply sent to counsel on 14.03.2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs-2012	EP-1a026992 7 IN	3/62/54/2012/Legal/NWR	Candidate had appeared for the post of Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012 at BSF Jammu and was found not medically fit as per the document submitted by them. The practice followed by the CPOs in case any candidate is not medically fit is that they allow the candidate to file an appeal and after receiving the appeal a fresh date is given by the CPOs and on that particular day the applicant has to appear for the Review Medical Examination and from the document it seems that the candidate not at appeared for the review medical examination

							therefore the applicant to kindly approach BSF to know the date of his review medical examination and SSC has no role to conduct of review medical examination.
55	Rajesh Kumar represented by Sh.B.S. Chaba, Advocate	2404500576	Reply sent to counsel on 14.03.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBP-2011	EP-102699265 IN	3/62/55/2012/Legal/NWR	This regional office based Chandigarh has no role in this case except to remind SSC (NR) and SSC HQR. for taking necessary action on priority to revise the result of this candidate further the candidate has scored 50 marks and he is eligible to get selected in RL2. Therefore the candidate to kindly contact northern regional office of SSC at New Delhi to enquire the status of this candidate and after the nomination he may contact ITBP to get offer of appointment letter.
56	Sh Mahipal Samota represented by Sh.Vikas Ganan, Advocate	2401500037	Reply sent to counsel on 13.03.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBP-2011	EP-10269910 IN	3/62/56/2012/Legal/NWR	This candidate was also called as a additional candidate and his documents were verified by the ITBP and they have furnished the verified data and on the basis of verified data SSC HQR. had issued the revise list II 18 th April 2012 and ITBP has to issue the offer of appointment letter. Further the candidate belongs to OBC but his result is declared in ST category and in such cases whenever there is a mismatch of category a proposal is sent to SSC HQ. for revised result and in this case ITBP has to send the proposal to HQ. for revised result.
57	Deepak Kumar represented by Sh.Pawan Sharma, Advocate	301109577	Reply sent to 15.03.2013	Constable (GD) in ITBP-2011	EP-102699605 IN	3/62/57/2012/Legal/NWR	The document verification of the candidate during medical examination was done by officials of the concerned regional office and after selection they have been nominated by the same regional offices. The candidate is selected in RL2 with their Rank No. of RL2/03183 and the candidate belongs to OBC but selected as General Candidate.

							Candidate should approach the concerned region office of SSC who has rejected the candidature.
58	Divya Pratap Singh represented by Sh.Rahil Raja, Advocate	-	Reply sent to advocate on 5 th April, 2013	Combined Graduate level-2012	File is in with the writ petition file	3/62/58/2012/Legal/NWR	As per the direction of the Hon'ble Court we had referred the matter to SSC Hqr since they are the competent authority to allow any candidate to appear in the interview board. However SSC Hqr had directed this office to file a review petition for reconsideration of the order given by the Hon'ble court for holding the interview of the candidate since there are around 1500 candidates those has been awarded zero marks. As per the instructions, only zero marks has been awarded to your client because he/she has failed to code the complete ticket no. in the answer sheet, therefore SSC has only followed the instruction and acted accordingly.
59	Ajay Kumar represented by Sh.Baljinder Singh, Advocate	1402001440	Reply sent to advocate on 5 th April, 2013	GD-12	EP102701834 IN	3/62/59/2012/Legal/NWR	The candidate was qualified in the select list due to wrong data means he was shown as medically fit whereas he was unfit in the initial medical examination. In the select list only such candidates are considered those having directed fir Re-Medical Examination are suppose to file an appeal for Re-medical Examination.
60	Gagandeep represented by Sh.Lakhwinder Singh Saini, Advocate	1402535636	Letter has been sent to Hqr on 12 th April 2013 and to advocate on 15.04.2013	GD-2011	EP10270516 4IN	3/62/60/2012/Legal/NWR	The candidate did not opted for the Border District and he failed to mention in the application form. A Copy of application form is enclosed herewith and due to that he was not considered in the Border Area. It is also mentioned in the notice that the candidate should go through the detail instruction contained in this notice carefully. Also in the declaration form the candidate has declared that all the statement made in this applications are true, complete and correct to the best knowledge of the

							candidate.
61	Pankaj kumar represented by Sh.Rohit Joshi, Advocate	1202502022	Reply sent to advocate on 30 th April, 2013	GD-2011	EP115119 84 3IN	3/62/61/2012/L egal/NWR	The candidate could not be able to score the cut off marks fixed for Reserve List for UR candidates and due to that he could not be selected,
62	Sh. Vijay Kumar represented by Sh.Pawan Sharma, Advocate	1601032568	Reply sent to Advocate on 7 th June,2013, A letter also sent to Hqr and to Commissioner of Mohali on 10 th Sep 2013	GD-2012	EP221301 24 0IN EP248273 233 IN & EP248273 220 IN of 10 th Sep 2013	3/62/62/2013/L egal/NWR	The candidate had appeared in the selection process for the post of Constable (GD) in CAPF- 2012. The candidate as opted for 4 posts that is A (BSF), B (CISF), C(CRPF), E (ITBP). The candidate has secured 65 marks in written examination and the cut off marks for selection for BSF was 69, for CISF 73, for CRPF highest was 71 and lowest was 65 and ITBP highest was 71 and lowest was 66 and candidate could not able to get selected may be due to reason of tie cases and under which criteria of tie cases he has been missed out from the selection shall only be intimated by the SSC Hqr and we are referring the matter to them for informing the reason for non-selection of Sh. Vijay Kumar.
63	Sh. Ankush Thakur represented by Sh.Vikrantjeet Singh, Advocate	1202506159	Reply sent to Advocate on 7 th June, 2013.	GD-2011	E2213012 9 8IN	3/62/63/2013/L egal/NWR	The candidate had secured only 49 marks in the written examination for the post of Constable (GD) in BSF, CISF, CRPF, SSB- 2011and cut off marks for the Unreserved candidates belongs to Himachal Pradesh for the post of CRPF in the Select List was 57 and the candidate has only opted for CRPF as post preference in his application form. Therefore it could be seen that although the candidate was medically FIT but he could not able to secure the marks that is 57 which was fixed by the SSC HQr for

							Selection for the UR candidates belongs to Himachal Pradesh for the post of Constable (GD) in CRPF.
64	Sh. Akshay Sayal represented by Sh. Kewal Singh Rana, Advocate	1202500416	ITBP has already furnished the reply to the applicant further the legal notice was sent to ITBP only.	GD-2011	Reply sent by ITBP	3/62/64/2012/Legal/NWR	
65	Sh. Vikas Kumar represented by Sh. Jitender Yadav, Advocate	1801502147	Reply sent to Advocate on 7 th June, 2013.	GD-2011	EP22130128 9IN	3/62/65/2013/Legal/NWR	The candidate had appeared in the Selection Process for the post of Constable (GD) in ITBP 2011. The candidate has secured 48 marks in written examination and the cut off for UR candidate in RL 2 was 48. Therefore the candidate could not be able to get selected may be due to the reason of tie cases and under which criteria of tie cases he has been missed out from the selection shall only be intimated by the SSC HQR and we are referring the matter to them for informing the reason for non-selection of Sh. Vikash Kumar.
66	Sh. Shashi Kumar represented by Sh. Shivraj Singh Patial, Advocate	1202000679	Reply sent to Advocate on 7 th June, 2013.	GD-2011	EP221301236 IN	3/62/66/2013/Legal/Notice	The candidate had secured only 37 marks in the written examination for the post of Constable (GD) in BSF, CISF, CRPF, SSB- 2011 and cut off marks for the Unreserved candidates belongs to Himachal Pradesh for the post of CRPF in the Select List was 57 and the candidate has only opted for CRPF as post preference in his application form. Therefore it could be seen that although the candidate was medically FIT but he could not be able to secure the marks that is 57 which was fixed by the SSC HQR for Selection for the UR candidates belongs to Himachal Pradesh for the post of

							Constable (GD) in CRPF.
67	Sh. Naresh Chand represented by Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate	1202502086	Reply sent to Advocate on 7 th June, 2013.	CT (GD) in ITBP – 2011	E P2213012 5 3IN	3/62/67/2013/Legal/NWR	The recruitment for Constable (GD) in ITBP- 2011 there were 3 Merit List was declared and the first merit list was declared on 18 th Aug 2011 which is known as Select List and in this the vacancies are Reserved for each state and the cut off marks for Unreserved candidates from Himachal Pradesh was 62. The Second merit list was known as Reserve List was declared on 13 th Sep, 2011 in which the candidates those who could not able to qualify in the Select List are considered and in this list such unfilled vacancies were filled up from the candidate from the surplus state and the cut off marks for Unreserved Candidate was 66. After then it has been decided by the Ministry of Home Affairs and Staff Selection Commission to call the additional candidates to fill up the large number of vacant post and such candidates were considered in the Third merit list which was known as Reserve List II declared on 18 th April 2012 and in this the cut off marks for unreserved candidates was 48. Therefore you could see that the CPIO has send the correct information that cut off marks was 62 in Select List and 48 in Reserve List II however he could not given the complete information and because of that the confusion has been created.
68	Sh. Hari Singh represented by Sh. K.B. Bery, Advocate	1402523967	Reply sent to the advocate on 24 th July 2013	Const (GD) 2011	EP221307 02 1IN	3/62/68/2013/Legal/NWR	The review medical examination is the sole domain of Central Armed Police Forces and regional office of Staff Selection Commission (SSC) has no role to play in this. Such candidates those were found medically unfit in the first medical examination had to apply an

	e						<p>appeal to the concerned CFPF for in the review medical examination. After then all the candidates has been issued a fresh date to appear in the review medical examination by the CFPF and then the data of such candidates those were found medically fit has been sent by the CFPF to the SSC Headquarter for processing the result. I am forwarding the copy to the BSF to know the status of his review medical examination. Further I would also like to inform you that the candidate has scored only 39 marks and the cut off marks for the Reserve List-II was BSF (38), CRPF (44), CISF (44), SSB (35). Even though we have no record about his medical fitness still from the merit list we could see that candidate has scored less marks then the cut off marks and due to that even if he has found medically fit then even he could not be selected. Further the matter is under consideration in the SSC Headquarter to revise the result of all such candidates those were found medically fit in the review medical examination but due to high merit in the Reserve List-II they could not be able to get selected and all such candidates shall be treated with the cut off marks of the Select List candidates and if we compare the case of Shri Hari Singh with the select list candidates then it is that he has scored 39 marks and the cut off marks for BSF was 38, CRPF 44, CISF 44 & SSB 35 and if the candidate is medically fit then he is likely to be selected for BSF & SSB.</p>
69	Sh. Inder Dev represent	1202505093	Reply sent to the advocate on 24 th July	Const (GD) 2011	EP221306 40 5IN	3/62/69/2013/L egal/NWR	I would like to inform you that in the earlier letter which was sent on 2 nd Jan 2013 to Sh. S. P. Parmar, advocate it

	ed by Sh.S.P. Parmar, Advocate		2013				was inadvertently mentioned that the tie case is with BSF however the other fact was clearly mentioned in the letter that the petitioner has scored 56 marks and cut off marks was 59 for BSF & 56 for SSB and the tie is happened with SSB. Today again we have sent a reminder to SSC Hqr to get the exact reason of tie cases for the non selection of Sh. Inder Dev. After receiving the same we shall inform you, further every detail about the result is available on our website (www.ssc.nic.in) & (www.sscnwr.org)
70	Naresh Chand represented by Sh. S.C. Katoch, Advocate	1202502086	Reply sent to the advocate on 24 th July 2013	Constable (GD) in ITBP	EP221307 03 5IN	3/62/70/2013/Legal/NWR	The first result for the post of Constable (GD) in ITBP- 2011 was declared on 18 th August 2011 and this result is known as Select List because the vacancies were reserved state wise and it is already available on our website (www.ssc.nic.in) & (www.sscnwr.org). If you could peruse the merit list for the different state then it could be seen that the cut off marks was 62 for UR candidates belongs to Himachal Pradesh. After then a revise list I was declared on 13 th September 2011 in which the merit is based on all India basis and in that the cut off marks was 66 for UR candidates. After then SSC Headquarter in consultation with Ministry of Home Affairs has declared a list of 8657 candidates on 23 rd September 2011 for appearing in the detail medical examination. Then on 18 th April 2012 the reserve list II was declared in which all candidates those were found medically fit in the first medical examination but could not be selected in the select list which was declared on 18 th August 2011 were considered, all candidates those were called for medical examination in the second phase by the

						<p>list declared on 23rd September 2011 and all review medical cases were considered in the reserve list II and the merit in this list was 48 for UR candidate. The recruitment of Constable (GD) in CAPF is the additional job undertaken by SSC with their existing man power and the last date for receiving the application for ITBP was 4th March 2011 and the first result was declared on 18th August 2011 and it could be seen that within five and half months the physical test was conducted and written examination was held and also the medical examination was held and the candidates were spread throughout India. Further there is no provision as per the notice of the examination to inform each and every candidate about their selection or rejection and it is the responsibility of the candidate to keep a track of the website to see the result and other related information. I would also like to bring to your notice that whenever any error happened due to rush of work and when the candidate brought to our notice then always suitable action has been taken on that. On behalf of SSC I also like to inform you that this is the most transparent organization & largest recruiting agency in the world during last year we have recruited 90,000 candidates and we have received 1.6 crore applications and everything has been done within stipulated time period with complete fairness & transparency. Since the candidate has scored only 46 marks and this is below the cut off marks of 62, 66 and 48, therefore his name did not figured in the merit list, further the physical & medical test is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							only qualifying in nature and after medical fit it all depends on the merit list and to get selected a candidate has to score the minimum cut off marks fixed by SSC (Hqr), New Delhi and in this case the candidate's written marks was lower than the cut off marks.
71	Sh. Soni Ram represented by Sh. Rakesh Arora, Advocate	2404000802	Reply sent to the advocate on 24 th July 2013	ITBP 2011	EP221306 92 2IN	3/62(71)2013/Legal/NWR	The document verification was made by the ITBP officials and we do not have any record that why the candidate has been treated under UR category when he has posses the valid OBC certificate. Therefore, you are requested to kindly send a copy of his OBC certificate and also intimate us the date and venue of the medical examination of the candidate so that the matter could be examined in this office.
72	Sh. Vikram Kumar represented by Lalit Dogra, Advocate	1402529183	Reply sent to the advocate on 30.07.2013	Constable (GD) in CPO's 2012	EP221308 83 5IN	3/62/(72)2013/Legal/NWR	The review medical examination is the sole domain of Central Armed Police Force and after the completion of the review medical examination they send the medical status about the fitness of the candidate to the SSC Headquarter New Delhi. Then the result is processed by Headquarter considering the detailed marks of the candidate. Therefore to get qualify in the final merit list the candidate has to be medically fit whereas you have mentioned in your legal notice that candidate was medically unfit, therefore you are requested to kindly take up the matter with the BSF to know the exact reason about his medical unfitness and they are the competent authority to give the certificate about the medical fitness and without that SSC could not able to process the case of this candidate.
73	Sh. Sunil Kumar represent	ITBP-1203500977 & BSF -	Reply sent to advocate on 30.07.2013	ITBP- 2011 & Constable (GD) in	EP231308 93 7IN	3/62(73)2013/Legal/NWR	The candidate has scored only 38 marks in the ITBP exam and the cut off marks was 48 for UR candidate in Reserve List

	ed by Sh. Dinesh Singh, Advocate	1203502779		BSF,CISF,CRPF ,SSB 2011			II. Whereas in the BSF he has scored only 37 marks and the cut off marks for the UR candidate belongs to Himachal Pradesh for the force of BSF was 59, therefore due to less marks scored by the candidate than the cut off marks fixed by the SSC Headquarter the candidate could not able to get selected in the final merit list.
74	Sh. Ravinder Deshwal represented by Sh. Surinder Pratap Singh, Advocate	2201593370	Letter has been sent to Hqr on 26.08.2013, A letter also sent to advocate on 10 th Sep 2013	MTS 2011	EP248273 216 IN	3/62(74)/2013/Legal/NWR	Please refer to your legal notice no. En. No. D/1800/2003 dated 09.08.2013 and in this regard I would like to inform you that we have already sent a proposal to SSC Hqr on 26 th Aug 2013 for approving the proposal to nominate this candidate against the existing vacancy of MTS falls under the State of Haryana. A copy of the letter sent to the Hqr enclosed herewith for your information.
75	Sh. Sandeep Kumar	2201501666		Constable (GD) in ITBP 2011		3/62(75)/2013/Legal/NWR	The enclosures with the legal notice has not been sent and the issue was also brought to the notice of the counsel of the petitioner but till date enclosures has not yet been sent to this office and due to that the reply on the legal notice has not been sent.
76	Sh. Sita Ram represented by Sh. Devender Kumar, Advocate	1203500279	Letter sent to counsel on 10 th Sep 2013	Constable (GD) in 2011	EP248273 247 IN	3/62(76)/2013/Legal/NWR	Please refer to your legal notice no. nil dated 04.09.2013 and in this regard it is stated that Sh. Sita Ram Roll No. 1203500279 belongs to ST Category and he is a permanent residence of Himachal Pradesh. In the written examination he scored 50 marks which is below the cut off marks fixed by the Commission for the candidates belongs to ST Category from the State of Himachal. The cut off marks in the select list for different forces are BSF(54), CISF(64), CRPF(52) & SSB(53) and the cut off for Reserve List is

							BSF(60), CISF(74), CRPF(65) & SSB(59). The complete detail about the result of this recruitment which is declared on 28 th Nov 2011 is available on our website (www.sscnwr.org) & (www.ssc.nic.in).
77 (80 no. leg al not ice is me rge wit h this)	Sh. Pawan represent ed by Sh. Sanjeev aneja (Advocat e)	1601032240	30 th Sep 2013 & 08 th Nov 2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs Exam 2012	EP248277 093 IN	3/62/77/2013/L egal/NWR	The matter has been referred to CRPF at NEW DELHI for sending a suitable reply to the petitioner since they have to decide the cases related with the review medical examination. Please refer to your legal notice number dated 10.09.2013 on the subject mentioned above and in this regard I would like to inform you that the Detailed Medical Examination is conducted by the concerned Central Police Organization that means BSF, CRPF, SSB, ITBP etc and in this case CRPF has conducted the Medical Examination of the candidate. Such candidates who did not qualify in the Medical Examination then they were allowed to file in appeal for the Review Medical Examination. All the issues related with the Review Medical Examination is decided by concerned CPOs only and SSC has no role in this except to declare the result of such unfit candidates those were found medically fit in the Review Medical Examination. Therefore, we are referring the legal notice to the CRPF for taking suitable and necessary action for conducting Review Medical Examination
78	Sh. Sukhwinder Singh	1402505397	30 th Sep 2013	Constable (GD) in CPOs Exam 2012	EP248277 062 IN	3/62(78)/2013/L egal/NWR	Please refer to your legal notice number P/2817/2008 dated 20.09.2013 on the subject mentioned above and in this regard I would like to inform you that

	represented by Sumandeep Singh Advocate						<p>Shri Sukhwinder Singh, Roll No. 1402505397 belongs to OBC and secured only 50 marks in the written examination which is below the cut off marks fixed for the final selection for the state of Punjab. The cut off marks for final selection for BSF was (59), CISF (62), CRPF (57), SSB (59) and 56 for ITBP and Assam Rifles. The complete cut off marks with detailed write up is available on the website www.ssc.nic.in and www.sscnwr.org It is further intimated that Physical Standard Test and Medical Examination is only qualifying in nature and there is no marks prescribed for these two Tests. The final selection is based on the basis of the written marks scored by the candidates.</p> <p>In view the above observation, it could be seen that the petitioner could not able to score the minimum cut off marks fixed for the final selection. Therefore, he has not been selected. You are requested to kindly intimate the petitioner about the reasons for his non-selection.</p>
79	Sh. Tajinder Saini represented by Dinesh Mahajan Advocate	1402521349	25 th Nov, 2013	Constable (GD) 2011	EP248301 570 IN & EP248302 495 IN	3/62(79)/2013/Legal/NWR	<p>Please refer to your legal notice dated 18.11.2013 and in this regard it is stated that Ms Tajinder Saini Roll no 1402521349 a candidate for the recruitment of the post of constable(GD)in 2011 has scored only 43 marks in the written examination. The petitioner is a female candidate and the cut off marks is fixed separately for male and female candidates. The cut off marks for the final selection for female candidates was 57 for BSF, 56 for CISF and 59 for CRPF and for male candidates it was 38 for BSF, 40 for</p>

CISF and CRPF and 35 for SSB. A copy of the marks statement scored by the petitioner is enclosed herewith and the complete write up of the result which was declared on 18.11.2011 for female and 28.11.2011 for male is available on our website(www.sscnwr.org and www.ssc.nic.in).

The petitioner has scored less marks than the cut marks fixed for the female candidates for the three CPOs but instead she was found selected because her candidature was inadvertently considered with the male candidates and the cut off for BSF for male candidates belongs to Punjab was 38 and she had scored 43. Due to this anomaly she was found selected in spite of scoring less marks than the cut off marks fixed for female candidates. To rectify this error a proposal was sent to SSC(HQr) so that a formal revised result do get declared considering her candidature with female candidates even though in which she will not qualify on the basis of her less marks scored in the written examination.

80 (merge in 77)	Sh. Pawan Kumar represented by Sanjeev Aneja Advocate	1601032240	25 th Nov, 2013	Constable (GD) in CPOS 2012	EP248301 566 IN	3/62(80)/2013/Legal/NWR	Please refer to your legal notice dated nil received in this office on 18.11.2013 and in this regard it is stated that the matter to conduct the review medical examination has to be decided by the CRPF and they will have to respond to your legal notice. A copy of the legal notice was sent to CRPF on 30.09.2013 but they did not received it and then again a copy was again sent on 8.11.2013 vide Speed No EP 248302059IN. Therefore, you are requested to kindly make correspondence with CRPF to taking the decision at the earliest
81	Sh Jagroop Singh S/o Harjinder Singh represented by Ms Sarbjeet Kaur, Advocate	1402526253		CONSTABLE-2012		3/62(81)/2013/Legal/NWR	The petitioner has scored 58 marks in written examination and he has opted for only one post in his application form that is for CRPF in that he failed to get selected since the cut off marks for UR candidates belongs to Punjab was maximum 78 and minimum 62. The complete write up of the result which was declared on 17.10.2013 is available on our website www.sscnwr.org
82	Sh. Mohan Lal S/o Sh. Pale Ram represented by Sandeep Thakan Advocate	Not Mentioned	02.01.2014 & 18.02.2013	Constable (GD) 2011	EP248304 868 IN & EP248312 294 IN	3/62(82)/2013/Legal/NWR	Please refer to your legal notice dated 16.12.2013 which is received in this office on 17.02.2014 and this legal notice has been sent in response to our letter of even no. sent on 1 st Jan 2014 therefore the date of the latest legal notice is need to be rectified. Now I would like to inform you that the petitioner was found ABSENT at the time of Detailed Medical Examination and the process of the Recruitment is already completed and the result has been declared on 28 th Nov 2011. Further the matter should have been brought along with the correct OBC certificate in this office at the time of Medical Examination so that immediate action

							<p>could have been taken. Sh. Mohan Lal had secured 61 marks in written examination and he has opted the post preference as BDCA and he is a resident of Haryana State and the Cut off marks for the post preference which he has opted B for CISF the cut off is 77, D for SSB the cut off is 64, C for CRPF the cut off is 66 and A for BSF the cut off is 64. Therefore it could be seen that even the petitioner if appear in Medical Examination also he will not be able to qualify in the final merit list.</p> <p>In view of the above your are requested to kindly inform Sh. Mohan Lal accordingly that he has not secured the minimum cut off marks which is must to get selected in Final merit list which was declared on 28th Nov 2011.</p>
83	Mr. Suresh Kumar	1601500565	18.02.2014	Constable (GD) 2011	EP248123 03 IN	3/62(83)/2014/L egal/NWR	<p>1) Please refer to your legal notice dated 11.02.2014 which is received in this office on 17.02.2014 and in this regard you are requested to kindly send a copy of the OBC certificate of Sh. Suresh Kumar which is made on 28th June 2011 by the Tehsildar, Kaithal so that the matter could be examined for taking appropriate action. Further as mentioned at Para 14 in your legal notice that the reply of RTI dated 30th Sep 2013 is enclosed and in this regard it is stated that there is no enclosure found with this Legal Notice. Therefore you are requested to send a copy of OBC certificate and all the letters/representations sent by the candidate in this office since I am incharge of this office from 24th Nov 2011 and I give top priority to such grievance cases and if I remember no such reference has ever brought to my notice otherwise the matter could have been taken with SSC HQr for an appropriate remedial decision.</p> <p>2) Please refer to your letter no. Nil dated 3rd March, 2014 and in this regard I would like to inform you that the matter of Sh. Suresh Kumar, Roll no. 1601500565 and belongs to OBC category is a candidate of Constable (GD) ITBPF 2011 whose medical was</p>

							not conducted due to certain issues related to his OBC certificate and the same has been examined in this office and a proposal has been sent to SSC HQr for allowing Sh. Suresh Kumar to appear in the Detailed Medical Examination a fresh and the approval of the SSC HQr is awaited.
84	Ravi Kumar	1402503960	05.03.2014	Constable (GD) 2012	EP-24831425 5IN	3/62/84/2014/ Legal/NWR	The Petitioner belongs to SC category is a candidate of Constable (GD) in CPOs 2012 and has scored 35 marks in the Written Examination and he belong to Punjab and also to Border district but finally in the merit list which was declared on 17 th OC, 2012 the candidate has failed to qualify since the final cut off marks for the SC candidate belongs to Border District for the state of Punjab is 42 for BSF, 63 for CISF, 57 for SSB, 54 for ITBP and 55 for Assam Rifles. Therefore, it could be seen that Sh. Ravi Kumar has failed to score the cut off marks which is need for the final selection and there are so many other candidate also those who did not qualify in spite of medically fit since they were also failed to scored the final cut off marks which was needed to qualify finally. Further, the physical and medical qualification is only qualifying in nature and there is no marks given for that. I hope you understand the reason for non-selection since the petitioner failed to score the marks which was needed for final selection and due to that he was not selected.
85	Vikas Kumar	-	07.03.2014	Constable (GD) in ITBP Force, 2011	EP-24831440 6IN	3/62/85/2014/ egal/NWR	Please refer to your letter no. Nil dated 4 rd March, 2014 and in this regard as stated by you the fact of this case which has emerged to us is that of Sh. Vikas Kumar and belongs to OBC category is a candidate of Constable (GD) ITBPF 2011 whose medical was conducted but his OBC certificate was not accepted by the officials those were verifying the documents and due to that he was consider under UR category and in UR the cut off marks was 48 and the candidate also scored

							48 marks but then also he has not been selected. Now, I would like to inform you that the candidate under UR category failed to get selected since it is tie case, however, his case under OBC category shall definitely be examined and for that kindly send his both the OBC certificates so that the matter could be examined and if any mistakes has occurred then the same shall be send to SSC HQr at New Delhi for remedial action.
86	Sandeep Kumar	2201000470		Constable (GD) in ITBP		3/62/86/Legal/N WR	