

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

CM No. 4696/2026 in
WP(C) No. 1038/2025 c/w
WP(C) No. 1039/2025 &
WP(C) No. 1040/2025

Date of Pronouncement: 29.07.2026

Date of Uploading: 29.07.2026

Guljan Begum

.....Applicant/Petitioner

Through :- Mr. Amit Bhardwaj, Advocate.

v/s

UT of J&K & Ors.

.....Respondents

Through :- Mr. Z.A. Qazi, Advocate
(Through Virtual Mode)

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

ORDER
29.07.2026

1. Given the submission made, the matter is pre-poned for today. **CM No. 4696/2026 is *disposed of*.**

WP(C) No. 1038/2025 c/w WP(C) No. 1039/2025 & WP(C) No. 1040/2025

2. Heard the counsel for the parties.

3. The petitioner is aggrieved of the order passed by respondent No. 2, the Financial Commissioner (Revenue), J&K, whereby the transfer application preferred by the petitioner seeking transfer of three appeals titled "*Guljan Begum v. Abdul Khaliq*", arising out of Mutation No. 180,181 dated 09.01.1978 and mutation no.269 dated 12.01.1998 and 385 dt. 3.3.1984 and pending before the Court of the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Kotranka, to the Court of the Joint Financial Commissioner, J&K, Jammu, or the

Divisional Commissioner, Jammu, or any other competent authority for its fair and proper adjudication, came to be rejected.

4. The case set up by the petitioner is that the Reader of the concerned Appellate Authority by virtue of his official position, was exercising influence over the said authority. On that premise, the petitioner entertained an apprehension that she would not receive a fair and impartial adjudication of her appeals.

5. The transfer applications did not find favour with the Financial Commissioner (Revenue), who observed that the appeals had remained pending for more than five years and that there was no material on record to substantiate the petitioner's apprehension or to suggest that the Appellate Authority was acting under the influence of its Reader or any member of its ministerial staff.

6. It is noteworthy that the petitioner had not levelled any allegation against the Presiding Officer of the Appellate Authority, nor has any circumstance been brought on record to indicate lack of impartiality or bias on the part of the said authority. In the absence of any such material, no ground is made out for interference.

7. When the matter was taken up for consideration, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner was unable to point out any legal infirmity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order. The contention that the Financial Commissioner (Revenue) had failed to consider the petitioner's case is wholly misconceived, as a perusal of the impugned order reveals that the petitioner's contentions have been examined in detail and dealt with by assigning cogent reasons.

8. Since the petitioner had admittedly raised no grievance against the Presiding Officer of the Appellate Authority, her contention that the authority was likely to act under the influence of its Reader was rightly held by the Financial Commissioner (Revenue) to be a mere apprehension, unsupported by any credible material. Significantly, the Financial Commissioner (Revenue), while rejecting the transfer application, directed that the concerned Reader shall stand disassociated from the proceedings in the appeal. Once the petitioner's apprehension had been adequately addressed by such direction, no justifiable cause survived for challenging the impugned order.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon consideration of the material available on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for interference is made out in exercise of its writ jurisdiction.

10. Consequently, the writ petitions being devoid of merit, are **dismissed**. However, the Appellate Authority is directed to make an endeavour to decide the pending appeals expeditiously, after affording adequate opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned. The record, if received by this Court, shall be returned forthwith to the concerned authority.

(Sanjay Parihar)
Judge

JAMMU
29.07.2026
Sneha

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