

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

WP(C) No. 2537/2026

CM No. 5517/2026

Sajjad Ahmed.

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

Through: Mr. Nasir Mirza, Advocate

vs

UT of J&K and ors. .

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Ms. Saleeqa Sheikh, Advocate vice
Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE WASIM SADIQ NARGAL, JUDGE

ORDER

14.08.2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to the panel prepared by the ZEO Kotranka, Budhal in which the petitioner figured at Serial No. 1 and having a percentage of 74.5 marks and qualification of M.A., B.Ed for the post in question.

2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the said panel was prepared in 2013 although no date has been specified in the said panel. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the respondents without any rhyme and reason and without conducting any proper inquiry, have issued a revised select panel on 24.04.2018, whereby the name of the petitioner has been excluded from the said panel and instead the name of another candidate namely Mohd. Qadeer has been shown who was inferior in the merit and was having qualification of B.A, B.Ed only.

3. The respondents have not assigned any reason for issuance of the revised panel which though was issued in 2018 and feeling aggrieved of the same, the petitioner has filed a detailed

representation which has been placed on record as Annexure-V on 03.08.2026 for withdrawal of the said revised panel and according consideration to the case of the petitioner in terms of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case titled **Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir and ors. Vs. Saba Wani; 2026 INSC 439'**.

4. Since the name of the petitioner does not figure in the fresh select panel, therefore, in the light of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the case of the petitioner cannot be accorded due consideration.

5. When learned counsel was confronted with the maintainability of the petition at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied, in case a direction is issued to the concerned ZEO to accord due consideration to the representation alleged to have been filed by the petitioner within a reasonable time.

6. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length and perused the record.

7. Issue notice. Notice waived by Ms. Saleeqa Sheikh, Advocate appearing vice Mr. Raman Sharma, learned AAG. She is not averse to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, the instant petition is taken up for disposal. Since the innocuous prayer has been made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of at the very threshold by directing respondent No. 4 to accord consideration to the representation alleged to have been filed by the petitioner which has been placed as Annexure-V within a period of four weeks from the date a copy of this order along with this petition and its annexures are made

available to the respondents in accordance with law and as per rules.

9. It is made clear that while according consideration to the representation alleged to have been made on 03.08.2026, all the stakeholders including the petitioner and private respondents and any other person who may be aggrieved of the same be given an opportunity of being heard before taking a final decision in this regard.

10. It is further made clear that if decision goes in favour of the petitioner, then the respondents shall proceed further and accord consideration in favour of the petitioner strictly in the light of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court and conversely, in case, if the decision goes against the petitioner, the petitioner will be at liberty to work out his remedy in accordance with law.

11. The writ petition is disposed of in the manner indicated above.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)
Judge

Jammu
14.08.2026
Tarun