

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH AT JAMMU

(Through Virtual Mode)

HCP 116/2025

Pronounced on 10.03.2026.

Uploaded on: 10.03.2026

**Mohd. Saleem alias Bajju (wrongly
written as Bachu), Age 28 years,
R/o Village Baishty, Tehsil Chenani,
District Udhampur,
At present lodged in Central Jail, Kot
Bhalwal, Jammu
Through his father Hashim Din, age
53 years
S/o Sh. Gulab Din,
R/o Ward No. 7, Baishty, Tehsil
Chenai, District Udhampur**

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

Through: Mr. Rahul Raina, Advocate vice Mr. S.S Ahmad, Adv.

Vs.

- 1. The Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir through its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Civil Secretariat, Jammu-180001**
- 2. The District Magistrate, Udhampur- 182101**
- 3. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Udhampur-182101**
- 4. The Superintendent, Central Jail, Kot Bhalwal, Jammu-181122.**

...Respondent(s).

Through: Mr. Sumit Bhatia, GA.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHD YOUSUF WANI, JUDGE
JUDGMENT**

1. Impugned in the instant petition, filed under the provisions of Article 226 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner through his father is an order of detention bearing No. 08-PSA-2025 dated: 11.07.2025 passed by the respondent No. 2 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Detaining

Authority' for short), while invoking his powers under Section 8(1)(a) of the Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act' for short), whereby the petitioner has been ordered to be detained with a view to prevent him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order and lodged in the Central Jail Kot Bhalwal, Jammu. The petitioner-detenué has assailed the impugned detention order on the grounds, *inter alia*, that he is a citizen of India and a domicile of UT of Jammu and Kashmir, as such, within his rights to seek the enforcement of his constitutional as well as other legal/statutory rights; that he is of the age of 28 years and a permanent resident of village Baishty, Teshil Chenani District, Udhampur, who has been falsely branded as a habitual bovine smuggler for managing his prevention detention; that the impugned detention order has not been passed on any proximate or compelling necessity but on generalized and unverified allegations; that the grounds of detention reflect his involvement in two case FIR's and three Daily Dairy Entries out of which one case is disposed of and other one FIR No.0049/2025 dated 03.05.2025 u/s 223 BNS 11 PCA Act of P/S Chenani, is pending investigation when the Daily Dairy Entries are all unverified; that the Id. Detaining Authority has mechanically acted on the police dossier without conducting any independent verification or otherwise applying its own mind in respect of the matter; that even if the allegations against him are supposed to be true for arguments sake, they still pertain to law and order violations and not to acts prejudicial to public order as alleged; that he was not furnished with the complete set of the detention

record which has made him unable to make a timely representation against his detention order; that his detention is punitive in nature and camouflaged as preventive; that the impugned detention order is vitiated by procedural irregularities, absence of subjective satisfaction and colourable exercise of power by the Detaining Authority which make the same unconstitutional, illegal and liable to be set aside; that the grounds of detention are the verbatim of police dossier thereby indicating the non-application of mind by the learned Detaining Authority and that his illegal and unjustified detention tantamounts to the infringement of his Fundamental Right to Life and Liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

2. The respondents through their counter affidavit filed by the learned Detaining Authority i.e. respondent No. 2 resisted the instant petition on the grounds that none of the legal, fundamental or statutory rights of the petitioner-detenu have been infringed and the petition is utterly misconceived, false and frivolous deserving its dismissal. That the Senior Superintendent of Police, Udhampur vide his communication No. Conf/Dossier/2025/467-70 dated 01.07.2025 forwarded a dossier of activities of the petitioner to the answering respondent i.e. the Detaining Authority, making out a case for his detention being a habitual bovine smuggler in the area. That his escalating involvement in bovine smuggling characterized by a blatant disregard for the law, has profoundly disrupted the peaceful equilibrium of the region. That the actions of the petitioner-detenu are deeply detrimental to the public order, have instilled fear and animosity among the local population, disrupting the harmonious rhythm

of community life. That the activities of the petitioner-detenu are anti-social which can hurt the sentiments of particular community at large and create the feeling of enmity, hatred and disharmony on the ground of religion thereby likely to disturb the public order in the area. That the petitioner-detenu has been found to be implicated in numerous instances of bovine smuggling. That the petitioner-detenu is a habitual bovine smuggler and demonstrates the failure of conventional legal measures to deter his criminal behavior. That the petitioner-detenu was time and again warned to shun the path of illegal bovine smuggling and other criminal act. That the grounds of detention, were read over and explained to the detenu in the language the detenu understands. That the representation of the petitioner-detenu has been duly considered and rejected being without any merit. That the petitioner-detenu is a bovine smuggler by profession and his criminal activities and indictment in as many as 2 FIRs and 3 DD report. That besides Daily Dairy Entry No. 25 dated; 05.05.2025, Entry No. 31 dated: 07.05.2025 and Entry No. 23 dated: 20.05.2025 stand maintained with the Police Station, Chenani, regarding his illegal activities. That despite the registration of the aforesaid FIR(s) against the petitioner, he did not mend his behaviour and remained adamant in continuing the smuggling of bovine animals, leaving no alternative for the answering respondent but to invoke the provisions of the Public Safety Act in the larger public interest. That the answering respondent was aware that the petitioner/detenu is already involved in substantive offences, but keeping in view his activities which were highly prejudicial to the public law and order, the detenu was booked

under Public Safety Act, strictly as per the provisions of the same. That the answering respondent, after thoroughly perusing the contents of the dossier and the ground reports so received, was satisfied that, in view of the volatile nature of the petitioner-detenué and his repeated tendency to commit illegal activities prejudicial to public order, recourse to the normal laws may provide an opportunity to the petitioner-detenué to continue his nefarious designs of creating ill-will among the people, leading to disturbance of public order. That the petitioner is involved in case: FIR No. 0049/2025 under Sections 223 BNS, 11 PCA Act registered at Police Station Chenani. That besides the aforesaid FIR, Daily Dairy Reports vide No. 25 dated: 05.05.2025, DD No. 31 dated: 07.05.2025 and DD No. 23 dated: 20.05.2025 entered in the records at Police Station, Chenani, with regard to the involvement of the petitioner-detenué in smuggling of bovine animals and also his activities indicating his involvement of youth in the town. That the whole of the material relied upon by the answering respondent has been furnished to the petitioner-detenué and also read over and explained to him in the languages which he understood fully and in token of which his signature was obtained. That moreover the petitioner-detenué was informed that he can make a representation to the Government as well as the Detaining authority against his detention. That all the statutory requirements and constitutional guarantees have been fulfilled and complied with by the answering respondent. That the petitioner-detenué filed a detailed representation before the Government which was considered and found without merit. That the petitioner-detenué

is operating in a secret and systematic manner actively working to establish and expand the smuggling of bovine animals. That despite being arrested in previous cases, he has not shown any inclination to reform and instead he has resumed his criminal behaviour immediately after release, continuing to act in a way that is detrimental to the maintenance of public order. That the detention order in question has been passed by the answering respondent upon proper application of his mind on the basis of the record before him.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the parties in the matter.

4. The learned counsel Mr. Rahul Raina, Advocate vice Mr.S.S Ahmad, Advocate, while reiterating the stand already taken in the petition contended that the impugned detention order is the outcome of illegality and incorrectness for being devoid of application of mind and subjective satisfaction on the part of the Id. Detaining Authority. He contended that petitioner-detenué is alleged to be involved in case bearing FIR No. 0049/2025 registered at Police Station, Chenani. He submitted that as themselves admitted by the respondents 2 and 3 as per the grounds of detention and the dossier respectively, the case FIR No. 0049/2025 came to be registered with the Police Station, Chenani, on 03.05.2025 on some reliable sources under Sections 223 BNS, 11 PCA Act of P/S Chenani. That the said case FIR is pending investigation before the concerned police station. The learned counsel further submitted that the Daily Dairy Entries alleged to have been recorded in the same Police Station pertain to the allegations of smuggling of bovine by the petitioner without any sort of

verification. He contended that the Daily Dairy Entries cannot be relied upon for want of corroboration.

The learned counsel very vehemently contended that the Id. Detaining Authority has misused its power vested in it under the Act by ordering the preventive detention of the petitioner-detenu on the allegation of his illegal activities which may amount to infraction of General Law and Order and not disorder in the society. He contended that none of the allegations/involvements amount to breach of public order as defined under Section 8(3) of the Act. He further submitted that it is well settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a catena of judgments that there lies a marked distinction between the acts amounting to breach of law and order and the acts prejudicial to the social order.

The learned counsel also contended that the detention record in its entirety especially the grounds of detention, the Police Dossier and the documents regarding criminal cases were not furnished to him which amounts to the violation of the mandatory provisions of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India read with Section 13 of the Act.

The learned counsel submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, it is quite clear that the detention of the petitioner-detenu is apparently illegal, as not being justified under the provisions of Section 8 of the Act. He contended that the impugned detention order is the outcome of non-application of mind on the part of Id. Detaining Authority.

5. The leaned counsel for the petitioner in support of his arguments placed reliance on the authoritative judgments cited as, "*Ankit Ashok Jallan*

vs. Union of India and Ors (2020) 19 SCC 127”, “*Khairul Haque, vs. State of West Bengal AIR Online 1969 SC 177*”, “*Jayanarain Sukul vs. State of West Bengal 1970 (1) SCC 219*”, “*Dr. Rahmantullah vs. State of Bihar and Another AIR 1981 SC 2069*”, “*Ishfaq Amin Bhat vs. UT of J and K and Ors 2021 CrI L J (NOC) 686 J&K*”.

The learned counsel for the petitioner sought the quashment of the impugned detention Order.

6. *Per contra*, the ld. UT Counsel submitted that the petition is liable to be dismissed as none of the constitutional or any other statutory rights of the petitioner have been infringed by the respondents. He submitted that the detention order impugned in the petition has been passed on the due application of mind by the ld. Detaining Authority who was satisfied on the basis of the record of the dossier and the field inputs gathered by him that the activities of the petitioner are likely to endanger the public order. He contended that despite earlier registration of criminal cases against the petitioner and his being convicted in one of the cases, he did not mend his character but continued to indulge in aforesaid activities especially smuggling of bovine animals. He further contended that the object of the detention under the Act is preventive rather than punitive and is aimed at to debar an individual beforehand from indulging in activities prejudicial to the public order. He further contended that there is a close proximity between the illegal activities of the petitioner/detenué and the passing of the detention order as the illegal activities as covered in the case FIR and the Daily Dairy Reports spread over a period from 22.11.2022 to

20.05.2025. The ld. State Counsel further contended that the petitioner/detenu who is of the age of about 28 years is known as habitual bovine smuggler in the area. That his criminal behaviour is becoming more serious and the general public has been registering its strong resentment for the actions of the petitioner-detenu regarding bovine smuggling.

7. The learned UT counsel further contended that the copies of the detention record in entirety were furnished to the petitioner/detenu who has acknowledged the receipt of the same at the time of his detention. That he was also informed of the grounds of detention in the language understood by him with further information that he has a right to make a representation to the detaining authority as well as to the Government. The ld. UT Counsel in support of his arguments placed reliance on the judgments cited as “ ***R. Kalavathi vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2006) 6 SCC 14; HCPNo. 55/2024 titled Shakeel Mohd vs. Union Territory of J&K; WP(Cril) No. 29/2022 titled Mohd Amin vs. UT of J&K and ors.***”

8. I have perused the instant petition, the reply affidavit and have also gone through the detention record produced by the ld. UT Counsel.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid perusal and the consideration of the rival arguments advanced on both the sides in the light of law on the subject, this Court is of the opinion that a ground is made out for interfering with the impugned detention order as the same suffers from patent illegality, misuse of power and non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority.

10. The main issues for redressal in the instant case are:

- I. Whether the allegations against the petitioner culminating into registration of two Case FIR's one is already disposed of and three General Dairy Reports have the tendency to be prejudicial to the social order and if the answer is in the negative, whether the impugned detention order suffers from non-application of mind?
- II. Whether there is proximity between the alleged activities and the object for passing of the impugned detention order?

11. Taking the first issue for determination, the Court in the facts and circumstances of the case is of the opinion that although the criminal acts of petitioner which have culminated into the registration of two case FIR's one of them presently under investigation and the other one is disposed of, no doubt, amount to infraction of law and order by falling within the definition of relevant offences under IPC/BNS, yet the same have not the implication of disturbing the 'social order'. The aforesaid case FIR is under investigation in the concerned police station. The said FIR pertains to the alleged occurrence of 03.05.2025. The allegations made therein, as mentioned hereinbefore, relate to an issue of law and order and not to public order. The three Daily Dairy Entries dated 22.11.2022 to 20.05.2025, recorded at Police Station Chenani, pertain to the allegations regarding the activities of the petitioner, to the effect that he was allegedly involved in the smuggling of bovine animals. The said Daily Dairy Entries without being substantiated/verified and being based on the alleged information cannot be relied upon. The allegations under the aforesaid case FIR and three Daily Dairy Entries, even if supposed to be true or proved for arguments sake, yet they cannot amount to activities prejudicial to social order.

12. It is apt to reproduce the provisions of Section 8(3) of the Act which defines the social order for the purposes of Section 8(1)(a) of the Act.

“8. Detention of certain persons

(3) For the purposes of sub-section (1)

[(a) omitted.

(b) “acting in any manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order” means –

(i) promoting, propagating or attempting to create, feelings of enmity or hatred or disharmony on ground of religion, race, caste, community, or region;

(ii) making preparations for using, or attempting to use, or using, or instigating, inciting, provoking or otherwise, abetting the use of force where such preparation, using, attempting, instigating, inciting, provoking or abetting, disturbs or is likely to disturb public order;

(iii) attempting to commit, or committing, or instigating, inciting, provoking or otherwise abetting the commission of, mischief within the meaning of section 425 of the Ranbir Penal Code where the commission of such mischief disturbs, or is likely to disturb public order;

(iv) attempting to commit, or committing, or instigating, inciting, provoking or otherwise abetting the commission of an offence punishable with death or imprisonment for life or imprisonment of a term extending to seven years or more, where the commission of such offence disturbs, or is likely to disturb public order;

[(c) “smuggling” in relation to timber or liquor means possessing or carrying of illicit timber or liquor and includes any act which will render the timber or liquor liable to confiscation under the Jammu and Kashmir Forest Act, Samvat, 1987 or under the Jammu and Kashmir Excise Act, 1958, as the case may be;]

[(d) “timber” means timber of Fir, Kail, Chir or Deodar tree whether in logs or cut up in pieces but does not include firewood;]

[(e) “Liquor” includes all alcoholic beverages including beer]”.

13. The Hon‘ble Apex Court has in a catena of judgments noted the difference between, “**law and order**” and “**public order**”.

14. In **Ram Manohar Lohia Vs. State of Bihar (1966) 1 SCR 709**, it was held by the Hon‘ble Apex Court through Hon‘ble M. Hidayatullah. J. (as the Chief Justice then was) at para 54 as under: -

“54. Public order if disturbed, must lead to public disorder. Every breach of the peace does not lead to public disorder. When two drunkards quarrel and fight there is disorder but not public disorder. They can be dealt with under the powers to maintain law and order but cannot be detained on the ground that they were disturbing public order. Suppose that the two fighters were of rival communities and one of them tried to raise communal passions. The problem is still one of law and order but it raises the apprehension of public disorder. Other examples can be imagined. The contravention of law always affects order but before it can be said to affect public order, it must affect the community or the public at large. A mere disturbance of law and order leading to disorder is thus not necessarily sufficient for action under the Defence of India Act but disturbances which subvert the public order are.”

15. In **Arun Ghosh Vs. State of West Bengal (1970) 1 SCC 98** again Hon‘ble M. Hidayatullah, (CJ) observed that it is not the every case of a general disturbance to public tranquility which can be termed as public disorder and the test to be applied in such cases is whether the alleged act leads to the disturbance of the current of life of the community so as to amount to disturbance of the public order. That if the alleged act affects some individual or individuals leaving tranquility of the society undisturbed, the act cannot be termed as amounting to public disorder. In that case the petitioner/detenu was detained by an order of a district magistrate since he had been indulging in teasing, harassing and molesting young girls and assaults on individuals of a locality. While holding that the conduct of the petitioner/detenu could be reprehensible, it was further held that it (read: the offending act) does not add up to the situation where it may be said that the community at large was being disturbed or in other words there was a breach of public order or likelihood of a breach of public order.

The observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the said case at para 3 are reproduced as under:-

“3. Public order was said to embrace more of the community than law and order. Public order is the even tempo of the life of the community taking the country as a whole or even a specified locality. Disturbance of public order is to be distinguished from acts directed against individuals which do not disturb the society to the extent of causing a general disturbance of public tranquility. It is the degree of disturbance and its affect upon the life of the community in a locality which determines whether the disturbance amounts only to a breach of law and order. ... It is always a question of degree of the harm and its affect upon the community....This question has to be faced in every case on facts. There is no formula by which one case can be distinguished from another.”

16. In **Kuso Sah Vs. The State of Bihar (1974) 1 SCC 195**, the Hon'ble Apex Court through Hon'ble Y.V. Chandrachud, J. (as the Chief Justice then was) speaking for the Bench held at paras 4 & 6 as under:-

“4. The two concepts have well defined contours, it being well established that stray and unorganized crimes of theft and assault are not matters of public order since they do not tend to affect the even flow of public life. Infractions of law are bound in some measure to lead to disorder but every infraction of law does not necessarily result in public disorder.”

“6. The power to detain a person without the safeguard of a court trial is too drastic to permit a lenient construction and therefore Courts must be astute to ensure that the detaining authority does not transgress the limitations subject to which alone the power can be exercised.”

17. The allegations against the petitioner-detenu as per the pending investigation case arising out of the case FIR No. 0049 of 2025 of Police Station Chenani is the commission of the acts punishable under the sections 223 BNS and 11 PCA Act. There is no allegation against the petitioner-detenu regarding the commission of any act creating or attempting to create

any feeling of enmity, hatred or disharmony on the ground of religion, caste and community.

18. It is the admitted case of the respondent No.2 that the petitioner-detenu is not directly involved in the case FIR No. 0049 of 2025 of P/S Chenani.

19. There appears to be no proximity or live link between the alleged incident dated 03.05.2025 and the passing of the impugned detention order dated 11.07.2025. A period of about two months appears to have elapsed since the last alleged incident dated 03.05.25. The General Dairy Entries which are admittedly uncorroborated and unverified even on the part of the Police Station concerned cannot be considered so much so that to eclipse the most valuable right of liberty of an individual.

Otherwise also, irrespective of the proximity or the live link between the alleged last incident and the necessity for passing the impugned detention order, the alleged activities of the petitioner/detenu, which present a **law and order situation** to be dealt with under the normal law, cannot warrant or justify preventive detention on the pretext of “public disorder.””.

20. This Court in its opinion feels supplemented with the authoritative Judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India titled “*Rajinder Arora vs. Union of India and Ors*” AIR 2006(4) SCC 796, decided on 10th March, 2006. The relevant paras of the Judgment are reproduced as under: -

“The conspectus of the above decisions can be summarized thus:
The question whether the prejudicial activities of a person necessitating to pass an order of detention is proximate to the

time when the order is made or the live link between the prejudicial activities and the purpose of detention is snapped depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast rule can be precisely formulated that would be applicable under all circumstances and no exhaustive guidelines can be laid down in that behalf. It follows that the test of proximity is not a rigid or mechanical test by merely counting number of months between the offending acts and the order of detention. However, when there is undue and long delay between the prejudicial activities and the passing of detention order, the court has to scrutinize whether the detaining authority has satisfactorily examined such a delay and afforded a tenable and reasonable explanation as to why such a delay has occasioned, when called upon to answer and further the court has to investigate whether the causal connection has been broken in the circumstances of each case.

Similarly, when there is unsatisfactory and unexplained delay between the date of order of detention and the date of securing the arrest of the detenu, such a delay would throw considerable doubt on the genuineness of the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority leading to a legitimate inference that the detaining authority was not really and genuinely satisfied as regards the necessity for detaining the detenu with a view to preventing him from acting in a prejudicial manner. “

21. This Court in its opinion is also fortified with the authoritative judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court passed in case titled “*Rameshwar Shaw Vs. District Magistrate, Burdwan and another*”, AIR 1964 SC, 334, the relevant portion whereof is reproduced as hereunder:

“In deciding the question as to whether it is necessary to detain a person, the authority has to be satisfied that the said person if not detained may act in a prejudicial manner and this conclusion can be reasonably reached by the authority generally in light of evidence about past prejudicial activities of the said person. When evidence is placed, the Detaining Authority has to examine the said evidence and decide whether it is necessary to detain the said person in order to prevent him from acting in a

prejudicial manner. Thus, it was held that the past conduct or antecedent history of a person can be taken into account in making the detention order and it is largely from prior events showing tendencies or inclinations of a man that an inference could be drawn whether he is likely even in the future to act in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. Further the past conduct or history of the person on which the authority purports to act should ordinarily be proximate in point of time and should have the rational connection with the conclusion that the detention of the person is necessary, that it would be irrational to take into account the conduct of a person which took the place years before the date of detention”.

22. The opinion of this Court is also supplemented by another authoritative Judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court cited as “***Sushanta Kumar Banile Vs. State of Tripura & Ors***”. ***AIR, 2022 SC 4175***”, in which, it has been held that undue and unreasonable gap between the alleged accusation and the passing of the detention order snaps the live link between the two.

23. On the basis of the afore referred authoritative Judgments, this Court is of the opinion that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind before passing the impugned detention order.

24. It was incumbent upon the Detaining Authority to address to itself as to how the normal criminal law is inadequate to tackle the petitioner who is involved in the criminal case and stands bailed out. It is not the case of the respondents that the petitioner/detenué had violated the bail conditions nor is it their stand that they assailed the bail orders but did not succeed and, therefore, they bonafidely invoked the provisions of the

Act to detain the petitioner with the view to prevent him from repeating his alleged illegal activities of smuggling bovine animals.

25. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of "Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and Anr" reported in (2011) 5 SCC 244 has laid emphasis on the fundamental right to life and personal liberty of a citizen of India guaranteed under Article 21 of our Constitution and has, accordingly, stressed for taking great care and caution while passing any preventive detention orders so that same are passed in case of genuine and inevitable need only without any misuse or abuse of the powers.

26. The preventive detentions need to be passed with great care and caution keeping in mind that a citizen's most valuable and inherent human right is being curtailed. The arrests in general and the preventive detentions in particular are an exception to the most cherished fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The preventive detentions are made on the basis of subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority in relation to an apprehended conduct of the detainee by considering his past activities without being backed by an immediate complaint as in the case of the registration of the FIR and, as such, is a valuable trust in the hands of the trustees. The provisions of Clauses (1) and (2) of Article 22 of our Constitution are not applicable in the case of preventive detentions. So, the provisions of Clause (5) of the Article 22 of our Constitution, with just exception as mentioned in Clause (6), requiring for application of mind, subjective satisfaction, inevitability of the detention order, proper and prompt communication of the grounds of

detention and the information of liberty to make a representation against the detention order, are the imperative and detention order.

27. For the foregoing discussion, the impugned order appears to be the outcome of the non-application of mind and misuse of powers.

28. The petitioner/detenué has already suffered detention of about more than 7 months pursuant to the detention order.

29. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the impugned detention order bearing No. 08-PSA-2025 dated: 11.07.2025 passed by the respondent No. 2 i.e. District Magistrate, Udhampur, is quashed with the direction to the respondents to release the petitioner/detenué namely Mohd Saleem alias Bajju s/o Hashim Din r/o Village Baishty Tehsil Chenani, District Udhampur, forthwith from his preventive detention in the instant case.

30. The detention record is ordered to be returned back to the Office of the Id. GA Jammu against proper receipt.

31. **Disposed of.**

(MOHD YOUSUF WANI)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR
10.03.2026
Ayaz

Whether the judgment is speaking?	Yes
Whether approved for reporting?	Yes