

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAMMU BENCH, JAMMU**

Hearing through video conferencing

**O.A. No. 61/180/2021**

This the 08th day of February, 2021

**HON'BLE MR. RAKESH SAGAR JAIN, MEMBER (J)**  
**HON'BLE MR. ANAND MATHUR, MEMBER (A)**



1. Manchal Singh, Aged 38 years, S/o Late Sh. Sukhdev Singh, R/o Village Jagti Jagdambe, P.O. Kandoli Nagrota, Tehsil and District Jammu.
2. Sanjeev Kumar, aged 32 years, S/o Sh. Krishan Lal, R/o Village Upper Chinore, Roop Nagar, Jammu.

.....Applicants

(Advocate:- Mr. Nitin Bhasin)

**Versus**

1. Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir through Commissioner/Secretary to Government Housing and Urban Development Department, Civil Secretariat, Jammu/Srinagar-180001.
2. Financial Commissioner, Housing and Urban Development Department, Civil Secretariat, Jammu/Srinagar-180001.
3. Jammu Development Authority, through its Vice Chairman, Vikas Bhawan, Rail Head Complex, Jammu-180012.
4. Secretary, Jammu Development Authority, Vikas Bhawan, Rail Head Complex Jammu-180012.
5. Executive Engineer, Jammu Development Authority, Division No. 1, RHC Jammu-180012.

.....Respondents

(Advocate: Mr. Rajesh Thappa, Deputy Advocate General)

**ORDER**

**[O R A L]**

**(Delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Anand Mathur, Member-A)**

It is submitted by Mr. Rajesh Thappa, D.A.G. for respondents that the case pertains to Jammu Development Authority. As such, this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to hear the case.

2. Contention of learned D.A.G. has force and it is to be accepted. Jammu Development Authority has not been brought within the jurisdiction of this Tribunal by notification to be issued by the Central Government under Section 14 (2) of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.



3. The Tribunal cannot assume jurisdiction in respect of any service matter pertaining to the Jammu Development Authority under the Act. We accordingly hold that this Tribunal is not vested with any jurisdiction to entertain any petition related to any service dispute in the Jammu Development Authority.

4. In view of the submission made above, we are of the view that O.A. deserves to be dismissed and accordingly OA is dismissed for having no jurisdiction. Applicant is at liberty to approach appropriate forum, if he so desires. No order as to costs.

**(ANAND MATHUR)**  
**MEMBER (A)**  
*Arun*

**(RAKESH SAGAR JAIN)**  
**MEMBER (J)**