

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

WP(C) No. 956/2025

Vinod Singh

.....Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through :- Mr. Navneet Dubey, Advocate

v/s

Union of India and ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Through :- Mr. Vishal Sharma, Sr. Advocate (DSGI)
with Mr. Eishaan Dadhichi, CGSC

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE**

**ORDER (ORAL)
16.09.2025**

Sanjeev Kumar J

1. Impugned in this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is an order dated 09.12.2024 passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Jammu Bench [“the Tribunal”] in MA(E)-124 of 2022 in TA No. 01 of 2019/SWP No. 899 of 2017, whereby the execution petition filed by the petitioner for implementation of order dated 10.03.2022 passed in TA No. 01/2019 has been dismissed on the ground that the respondents have complied with the judgment.
2. **Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record**, we are of the considered opinion that the order impugned passed by the Tribunal does not suffer from any legal infirmity and therefore, cannot be interfered with by us in these proceedings. It needs to be taken note of that vide order dated 10.03.2022, TA/SWP filed by the petitioner came to be finally

disposed of by the Tribunal with a direction to the respondents to treat that application as representation and take a conscious decision keeping in view the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sandeep Kumar's** case within a period of three months. That judgment was not complied with and the petitioner filed the execution petition before the Tribunal. Before Tribunal, the respondents filed a compliance report, stating therein that the representation of the petitioner had been considered and that the petitioner had been reinstated w.e.f. 01.10.2022. Taking note of the aforesaid compliance report filed by the respondents, the proceedings in the execution petition were closed by the Tribunal in terms of the order impugned.

3. Having regard to the nature of directions passed in TA No. 01 of 2019 (SWP No. 899 of 2017), the respondents have considered the case of the petitioner and have also reinstated him in service. The grievance which is projected by the learned counsel for the petitioner before us is that while reinstating the petitioner, the respondents have not granted the consequential benefits. If that is the grievance, we are of the view that remedy of the petitioner lies in challenging the order of reinstatement without consequential benefits before the competent forum. Once the order passed by the Tribunal stood complied with, the Tribunal had no option but to dismiss the execution petition.
4. We find any merit in this petition and the same is, accordingly, **dismissed**, leaving it open to the petitioner to work out the remedy

for claiming the benefits which according to the petitioner have not been paid to him consequent upon reinstatement in service.

(Sanjay Parihar)
Judge

(Sanjeev Kumar)
Judge

JAMMU
16.09.2025
Neha-II

Whether the order is speaking:	Yes/No
Whether the order is reportable:	Yes/No

