

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

WP(C) No. 2333/2026

Amjad Ali Khan

.... Petitioner/Appellant(s)

Through:- Mr. Rakesh Chagotra, Sr. Adv. with
Ms. Sonia Manhas, Advocate

V/s

UT of J&K and others

.....Respondent(s)

Through:- Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SINDHU SHARMA, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SEKHRI, JUDGE

ORDER
29.07.2026

1. The challenge in this petition is to the order dated 16.07.2026, passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Jammu [“the Tribunal”] in MA No. 968/2026 in OA No. 914/2026 titled “*Amjad Ali Khan v. School Education Department*”, whereby the Tribunal has directed to list the M.A. along with O.A. on due date.
2. The petitioner, working as a teacher at GHS Chandyar, was transferred to UPS Kote Fgulta on 18.08.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted a representation against his transfer which was considered by the respondents and order dated 18.08.2025 was modified on 14.10.2025 and he was adjusted at GHS Doulah. On the representation of the petitioner, order dated 14.10.2025 was again modified and he was adjusted at GHS Siara. The petitioner thereafter approached the Central Administrative Tribunal, Jammu, by filing OA No. 17/2026 against the order dated 08.01.2026, whereby order of the petitioner’s adjustment was kept in abeyance.

3. This O.A. was disposed of on 19.01.2026 by directing the respondents to consider the O.A. as representation and decide the case of the petitioner by passing a reasoned and speaking order. The respondents in compliance to the orders of the Tribunal considered the representation of the petitioner and passed Order No. 215-DSEJ of 2026 dated 23.06.2026, vide which, the petitioner's claim was found devoid of merit and he was directed to report GHS Doulah for further duties. This Order No. 215-DSEJ of 2026 was assailed by the petitioner in OA No. 914/2026. The learned Tribunal issued notice in the O.A. on 02.07.2026, and thereafter listed it on 11.09.2026. The petitioner thereafter filed a miscellaneous application seeking urgent consideration of interim relief.
4. The grievance of the petitioner is that the Tribunal did not consider his miscellaneous application seeking urgent consideration of interim relief and merely directed the listing of this application along with the OA, which was fixed on 11.09.2026, without considering the grant of interim relief.
5. When the matter is taken up for consideration, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly made a statement at Bar that the petitioner would be satisfied if the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Tribunal to decide the interim application as expeditiously as possible. The statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is taken on record.
6. The impugned order has been passed at interlocutory stage of the proceedings and, therefore, no separate cause of action has arisen for the petitioner to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court at this

stage. Entertaining this petition would result in interference with the ongoing proceedings of the Tribunal, which ought to be avoided in the absence of exceptional circumstances, such as jurisdictional overreach or gross perversity.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Tribunal to consider and decide the petitioner's application for interim relief expeditiously, preferably within period of six weeks from the date a copy of this order is made available to it.
8. The writ petition is, accordingly, **disposed of** in the above terms, along with the connected CM.



(Rajesh Sekhri)
Judge

(Sindhu Sharma)
Judge

Jammu:
29.07.2026
Shafqat