

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

Uploaded on: 29.09.2026

**WP(C) No. 511/2021
CM No. 2419/2021**

Imtiaz Ahmad and others

...Petitioner /Appellant(s)

Through: - Mr. Nayeem Sheikh, Advocate

Vs.

Union Territory of J&K and others

...Respondent(s)

Through: - Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY DHAR, JUDGE

**ORDER (ORAL)
28.09.2026**

1. The petitioners, through the medium of the present petition, have challenged Government Order No. 919-Edu. of 2018 dated 16.11.2018, whereby the Rehbar-e-Taleem Scheme was closed. A further direction has been sought commanding the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners for their engagement as ReT Teachers.
2. As per case of the petitioners, the respondents, vide Advertisement Notice dated 26.09.2013 issued by respondent No. 3, initiated the process for engagement of ReT Teachers, pursuant to which the merit panel for engagement of ReT Teachers in Village Gohlad for Government Higher Secondary School (Girls), Mendhar, Middle School, Gohlad, GMS, Moh. Khokhran, and GPS, Hundi, was prepared by respondent No. 4, wherein petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 figured at Serial

Nos. 2 and 4. It has been submitted that thereafter the respondents prepared the tentative select list, in which names of the petitioners also figured, as they were falling in the consideration zone for engagement against the vacancies in Revenue Village Gohlad. However, the respondents did not issue appointment orders in their favour on one pretext or the other.

3. It has been submitted that petitioner No. 3 was empanelled in the select list for the post of ReT Teacher in NPS Thanda Nara. In respect of the said select panel, respondent No. 2 invited objections on 23.01.2015 from the aggrieved candidates. However, in view of the directions passed in SWP No. 832/2015 by this Court vide order dated 18.03.2015, the selection process was kept in abeyance. The said writ petition was finally decided on 09.01.2018, directing the respondents to take the selection process to its logical conclusion.
4. In respect of petitioner No. 4, it has been submitted that she had applied for the post of ReT Teacher pursuant to Advertisement Notice dated 04.10.2013, and the Zonal Education Officer, Nowshera, recommended her case in place of one Vikas Chowdhary. When the respondents did not take any action in the matter, petitioner No. 4 filed a writ petition bearing SWP No. 1066/2018, which was disposed of vide judgment dated 29.05.2018, directing the respondents to finalize the selection process.
5. Thus, according to the petitioners, their cases were pending before the respondents for finalization of the engagement orders. However, in the

meantime, the impugned Government Order dated 16.11.2018 came to be issued, whereby the ReT Scheme was closed.

6. Mr. Raman Sharma, learned AAG appearing for the respondents, has submitted that, with the closure of the ReT Scheme by the Government, no right of the petitioners survives or remains protected and, as such, the present writ petition deserves to be dismissed.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
8. As per the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Union Territory of J&K and others v. Saba Wani*, SLP (Civil) No. 12210 of 2023, decided on 30.04.2026, the closure of the Rehbar-e-Taleem Scheme would not impair the rights of candidates whose names find place in the select panel. It has been directed by the Apex Court in the said judgment that candidates placed in the respective select panels shall be issued engagement/appointment orders as per their position in the select panel, having regard to the available vacancies. In the said judgment, it has been made clear by the Supreme Court that the select panel would mean the panel which has been approved by the Directorate of Education. Thus, the right of only those candidates whose names find mention in the select panel approved by the Directorate of Education would remain subsisting even after the closure of the ReT Scheme, in terms of the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court in **Saba Wani's** case (supra).
9. In the present case, as per the documents placed on record by the petitioners, the names of petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 figured in the merit

panel prepared by the Zonal Education Officer, Mendhar, Poonch, and subsequently, their names also figured in the tentative select list prepared by the aforesaid officer. However, as per the own case of petitioner Nos. 1 and 2, the select panel was not approved by the competent authority for one reason or the other. Petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 have not placed on record any document to show that their names figured in the approved select panel.

10. So far as petitioner No. 3 is concerned, it is her case that she came to be empanelled as a selected candidate for the post of ReT Teacher in NPS, Thanda Nara. It has been submitted by petitioner No. 3 that objections were invited against the said select panel and that the selection process could not be finalized. This would mean that the name of petitioner No. 3 did not figure in any approved panel, as the panel was never approved by the competent authority.
11. Regarding petitioner No. 4, it has been submitted that her case for engagement as a ReT Teacher was recommended by the Zonal Education Officer in place of Vikas Chowdhary; however, no final decision was taken in the matter by the competent authority. This would mean that her name also did not figure in any approved select panel.
12. The relief claimed by the petitioners in the writ petition with regard to challenge to the closure of the ReT Scheme has become infructuous, as the order relating to the closure of the ReT Scheme has already been upheld by the Supreme Court. So far as the rights of the petitioners are

concerned, the same are not protected in view of the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court in **Saba Wani's** case (supra), as the select panels, in which their names figured, were never approved by the Directorate of Education. In fact, there is no averment in the writ petition to this effect. Therefore, on this ground, the rights of the petitioners stand vanished with the closure of the ReT Scheme in terms of Government Order No. 919-Edu. of 2018 dated 16.11.2018.

13. For the foregoing reasons, I do not find any merit in this writ petition. The same is, accordingly, **dismissed**.

(SANJAY DHAR)
JUDGE

Jammu:
28.09.2026
Karam Chand

