

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
ATSRINAGAR
(Through Virtual Mode)**

RP No.83/2025 in
WP(C) No.2036/2024

Gulzar Ahmad Dar and others

.....Appellant/Petitioner(s)

Through :- Mr. T. M. Khawja, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Iman Abdul Muizz, Advocate

v/s

Union Territory of J&K and others

.....Respondent(s)

Through :- None.

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

ORDER
29.05.2026

01. The petitioners, through the medium of present review petition, have sought review of judgment dated 29.08.2025 passed by this Court, whereby the writ petition filed by the review petitioners challenging the judgment/order dated 30.03.2021 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Jammu Bench, Jammu has been dismissed on the ground of 'delay and laches'.

02. Heard the learned Senior counsel appearing for the review petitioners and perused the record.

03. The writ petitioners have sought review of the judgment passed by this Court on 29.08.2025 on the grounds that the same suffers from errors which are apparent from the face of the record as the judgment has been passed on wrong assumptions that the judgment and the seniority list impugned in the writ petition had assumed finality. According to the review petitioners, the writ petition was filed by them when the other writ petitions which had been filed

against the same judgment passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal were still pending disposal before this Court. It has been further contended that this Court while passing the judgment under review has wrongly assumed that writ petitioners have remained contented with the promotion of private respondents and that they cannot be permitted to challenge the seniority list after a considerable period of time. It has further been contended that this Court has fallen into an error while dismissing the writ petition on the sole ground of 'delay and laches' as the case of the review petitioners was having substantial merit.

04. A perusal of the judgment sought to be reviewed would reveal that writ petition filed by the review petitioners has been primarily dismissed on the grounds of delay and laches as the review petitioners proceeded to challenge the judgment of the Central Administrative Tribunal, after more than three years of passing of the said judgment. It has also been noted by this Court that after passing of the judgment by the Tribunal, not only fresh seniority list on the basis of said judgment has been issued by the official respondents in the month of April, 2021, but the official respondents have also made promotions to Super Time Scale of Services and further initiated process of inducting the officers in Indian Administrative Services (IAS) on the basis of seniority list of 2011. This observation of the Court is not based upon assumptions but it is based upon the admission of review petitioners made in para (15) of the writ petition wherein it has been clearly averred that the respondents have made promotions to Super Time Scale of Services and also initiated the process of induction of officers in Administrative Service on the basis of 2021 seniority list. Thus, the contention of the review petitioners that observations of this Court are based on assumptions, is contrary to record.

05. So far as the contention of the review petitioners that they have a meritorious case and that 'delay and laches' should not come in their way, is concerned, the said issue cannot be deliberated upon by this Court while exercising its power under review. Once this Court has taken a view that it is not open to the review petitioners to challenge the judgment of the Central Administrative Tribunal, which has been implemented by the official respondents way back in the year 2021, the same cannot be changed by this Court in exercise of its power of review. Whether the said view is legally correct or not, cannot become the basis for reviewing the judgment. Merely because a Court has gone wrong in law cannot be a ground to review a judgment. It is only, if there is any error apparent on the face of the record, that this Court would be justified in reviewing its order/judgment. In the present case, the review petitioners have miserably failed to show any error on the face of record that would have persuaded this Court to exercise its power of review.

06. For the foregoing reasons, we do not find any merit in the review petition. The same is, accordingly, *dismissed*.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)
Judge

(Sanjay Dhar)
Judge

JAMMU
29.05.2026
Shammi