Suppl. Cause List-1
Serial No. 143

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH AT JAMMU

WP(C) No. 3410/2026
CM Nos. 7572/2026 &
7573/2026

Inhabitants of Village Taintly **…..Petitioner(s)**

Through: Mr. N D Qazi, Advocate.

Vs.

UT of J&K and ors.

….. Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Ravinder Gupta, AAG.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHAHZAD AZEEM, JUDGE

ORDER
27.10.2026

(**ORAL**)

01. The inhabitants of village Taintly, Tehsil Gandoh (Bhalessa), District Doda have invoked the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court, seeking direction to the respondents to adhere to and implement Government Order No. 440 dated 21.10.2014, whereby the Niabat Headquarter was sanctioned at Taintly and to maintain the said location in accordance with the aforesaid Government Order. The petitioners also seek a direction for restraining the respondents from shifting the location of the Niabat Headquarter from Taintly to any other location, including Harrah or Gurekhara, and from undertaking construction of the said headquarter at such alternative locations without due process of law.

02. It appears that, vide Government Order No. 440 dated 21.10.2014, Taintly was carved out as a new Niabat and its headquarter was also fixed at

Taintly, for which the respondents issued notice inviting tenders for construction of the buildings to accommodate various Government departments.

03. The inhabitants of Niabat Taintly now apprehending the shifting of its headquarter from Taintly to Harrah, therefore, approached this Court, seeking direction to the respondents for adhering to the Government Order No. 440 dated 21.10.2014, whereby new Niabat Taintly was carved out and its headquarter was kept at Taintly.

04. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in this regard, the inhabitants of Niabat Taintly have already filed a representation before the respondents for maintaining the sanctioned location of Niabat headquarter at Taintly in terms of Government Order No. 440 dated 21.10.2014 and for restraining its unauthorized shifting to Harrah/Girekhara.

05. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and on going through the averments contained in the petition, it appears that the respondents have neither initiated any process, nor there is any indication worth the name, giving rise to a genuine apprehension to the petitioner for invoking the jurisdiction of this Court.

06. Therefore, it is apparent that, merely on the basis of an apprehension, the petitioner wants to maintain this petition and seeks issuance of writ of mandamus, which is not legally tenable, so as to install the administrative decision, yet to take the shape of any tangible action. It is too early in the day to maintain the instant writ petition and no direction can be issued unless and until the respondents take a tangible action in this regard.

07. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed as being premature, alongwith connected applications.

08. Nonetheless, petitioners shall be at liberty to approach the Court, as and when cause of action arises.

(SHAHZAD AZEEM)
JUDGE

JAMMU
27.10.2026
Ram Krishan