

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

WP(C) No. 2917/2026

Aasiya Ali

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

Through: Mr. Qadiri Towkeer Nazir, Adv.

vs

Union Territory of J&K and others

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG with
Ms. Saliqa Sheikh, Adv.

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

**ORDER
14.09.2026**

1. The petitioner, through the medium of present petition, has challenged Notice bearing No. DH/RBN/1637 dated 07.09.2026, whereby eligible/shortlisted candidates, who had applied pursuant to Advertisement Notice No. 01 of 2026 dated 05.06.2026, have been called for Type Test, Written Examination and Interview for the different posts including the post of Counsellor. The petitioner has also sought a direction upon the respondents to reconsider her candidature for the post of Counsellor.
2. As per the case of the petitioner, the respondents had issued Advertisement Notice No. 01 of 2026 dated 05.06.2026 for hiring of contractual staff for setting up of Addiction Treatment Facility (ATF) under the National Drug Dependence Treatment Centre for District Hospital Ramban, whereby the applications were invited for various posts including one post of Counsellor.

3. The petitioner is stated to have responded to the said Advertisement Notice as she was fully eligible and qualified for the post of Counsellor. However, the respondents issued impugned Notice dated 07.09.2026, whereby while shortlisting the candidates for Type Test, Written Examination and Interview for the different posts including the post of Counsellor, the name of the petitioner was omitted.
4. The petitioner has challenged the impugned Notice dated 07.09.2026 on the ground that the respondents did not disclose the criteria, parameters, methodology or basis on which the petitioner, despite possessing the requisite qualification, has been excluded from the zone of consideration. It has further been submitted that the respondents have not conveyed to the petitioner the reasons for her exclusion from the short list. According to the petitioner the process of shortlisting has been conducted in a manner to favour blue eyed candidates.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. It appears that vide Advertisement Notice No. 01 of 2026 dated 05.06.2026, applications were invited by the respondents for hiring of contractual staff for setting up of Addiction Treatment Facility (ATF) under the National Drug Dependence Treatment Centre for District Hospital Ramban. One of the posts advertized was the post of Counsellor and the maximum qualification prescribed for the said post was Graduate in Psychology, Social Work/Sociology (preferable Masters in above disciplines). The minimum age prescribed for the said post was 21 years and maximum was 40 years. In the Advertisement Notice, the selection criteria was also published by the respondents. The

criteria prescribed for the post of Counsellor as given in the Advertisement Notice is as under:

- I) Graduation= 80 Points
 - (II) Masters= 10 Points
 - (III) Viva-Voce= 10 Points
- Note Item (I) & (II) on Pro-Rata Basis

In case of screening:

- (I) Screening = 40 Points
 - (II) Graduation= 40 Points
 - (III) Masters= 10 Points
 - (IV) Viva-Voce= 10 Points
- Note:- Item (I), (II), (III) on Pro-Rata Basis

7. It was further provided that the candidates will be called for *viva-voce* on the basis of 1:5 ratio. It seems that in light of the prescribed criteria, the respondents on the basis of points obtained by the candidates, who had applied for the post of Counsellor, issued the impugned short list wherein the petitioner did not make the grade. Instead five candidates, who had obtained more points as per criteria prescribed, were called for the *viva-voce*.
8. The contentions of the petitioner that criteria was not published along with Advertisement Notice is patently contrary to the record as the copy of the Advertisement Notice placed on record by the petitioner along with her writ petition clearly prescribes the selection criteria.
9. It is not the case of the petitioner that she had obtained higher points than the shortlisted candidates and it is also not the case of the petitioner that any shortlisted candidate had secured points less than her. Therefore, She cannot have any grievance in respect of the procedure or

exercise undertaken by the respondents for shortlisting the candidates in terms of impugned Notice dated 07.09.2026.

10. In view of what has been discussed and analyzed hereinabove, the present petition lacks merit and is dismissed accordingly.

(SANJAY DHAR)
JUDGE

Jammu
14.09.2026
Rakesh PS

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

