S. No. 28
Regular Cause List

INTHE HIGH COURT 0F JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH AT SRINAGAR

WP(C)/644/2020

SHABIR AHMAD BHAT

…Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. S.A. Makroo, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Musadiq Majeed, Advocate
Mr. Rahil Noor, Advocate
Mr. Danish Yousuf, Advocate

Vs.

UNION TERRITORY OF J AND K AND ORS. ...Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Zahid Qais Noor, GA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SINDHU SHARMA, JUDGE

ORDER

17.11.2026

1. Petitioner, by way of the present writ petition, has sought a direction to the respondents to include his name in the seniority list issued by respondent No.2 on 24.06.2016, in respect of various categories of employees of Urban Local Bodies, under the category of Tax Inspectors.

2. The petitioner further seeks a direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to confirm him against the post of Tax Inspector with effect from 09.10.2010 and release in his favour the grade pay attached to the said post, along with all other consequential service benefits, on the analogy of similarly situated persons whose names have already been included in the seniority list and who are being paid the grade pay attached to the post of Tax Inspector.

3. The petitioner has also sought consideration of his case for inclusion in the seniority list and a direction to the respondents to consider and decide

his representation seeking such inclusion before issuing the final/updated seniority list in respect of the category of Tax Inspectors.

4. Notice was issued on 14.03.2025. Learned counsel for the respondents despite repeated opportunities, have failed to file counter affidavit.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has already submitted a representation before the respondents seeking consideration of his claim for inclusion in the seniority list of Tax Inspectors. It is further submitted that the Directorate of Urban Local Bodies, Kashmir, vide communication No. DULB/Estt/1481-82 dated 26.04.2016, had circulated the seniority list inviting representations/objections from the concerned employees. However, the petitioner's representation has not been considered or decided till date.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation filed by the petitioner, to which learned counsel for the respondents has no objection, within a period of eight weeks from the date a copy of this order is made available to them, by passing a speaking order.

(SINDHU SHARMA)
JUDGE

Srinagar
17.11.2026
Shabroz