

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

WP (C) No. 2932/2026

Bahadur Singh

.....Applicant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through :- Mr. Asheesh Singh Kotwal, Advocate

v/s

U.T. of J&K and Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Through :- Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG with
Ms. Saliqa Sheikh, Advocate for R- 1 & 2
Mr. Suneel Malhotra, GA for R- 3 and 4.
Mr. Eishaan Dadhichi, GA vice
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG for R- 5 & 6

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MOKSHA KHAJURIA KAZMI, JUDGE

ORDER

16.09.2026

1. In this petition, petitioner herein has challenged the select panel bearing No. ZEO/Chass/922 dated 01.07.2026, issued by respondent No. 4, whereby respondent No. 7 was selected, her name figured at serial No. 6 in the select panel. The petitioner herein has also challenged the order dated 15.02.2017, passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Reasi, whereby, in terms of the judgment passed in SWP No. 582/2014, the Deputy Commissioner, Reasi has rejected the claim of petitioner being devoid of any merit.
2. Mr. Raman Sharma, learned AAG appearing for respondent Nos. 1 & 2 has vehemently argued that the instant petition is not maintainable in view of the judgment dated 30.04.2026 passed by the Apex Court in case titled ***"UT of J&K and others Vs. Saba Wani"***. It is further submitted that similar petitions are pending adjudication before this Court and, in view of the aforesaid judgment of the Apex Court, no relief has been granted to the petitioners therein.

3. In support of his submissions, learned AAG has relied upon clauses (h) and (i) of paragraph 25 of the judgment of the Apex Court ***“UT of J&K and others Vs. Saba Wani”***, 2026 INSC 439, decided on 30.04.2026, which read as under:

“(h) The directions contained in clauses (a) to (g) hereinabove shall apply to all the candidates who are litigating in any Court and such cases have been filed prior to the date of this judgement. It is further clarified that candidates who have not already filed cases in any Court shall neither acquire any fresh cause of action by virtue of these directions nor be entitled to seek any further directions from any Court in that regard.

(i) At the cost of repetition, it is clarified that this judgment shall not be construed as reviving the Ret Scheme for any purpose whosoever, nor shall it be interpreted so as to create or confer any right upon candidates who were not part of a prepared select panel or who failed to approach the Court timely. Moreover, these directions are being issued in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case invoking the power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India and it shall not be treated as precedent in any manner whatsoever.”

4. Admittedly, the petitioner had not challenged order dated 15.02.2017 before closing of the scheme on 16.11.2018.
5. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid position and the judgment dated 30.04.2026 passed by Supreme Court (supra), this Court is not inclined to pass any order in the instant petition, the same is accordingly dismissed along with connected application(s), if any.

(Moksha Khajuria Kazmi)
Judge

JAMMU
16.09.2026
Rahul Sharma