



## Central Administrative Tribunal Jammu Bench, Jammu

T.A. No.3556/2020  
(S.W.P. No.2796/2002)

Wednesday, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2020

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

Vijay Kumar, age – 35 years, S/o Late. Sh. Sant Ram, R/o Arazi, Samba, Ward No. 9, Post Office and Tehsil Samba, Distt. Jammu

...Applicant  
(Mr. K K Kundan, Advocate)

Versus

1. Director Handlooms Development Department, J&K Govt., New Plot Jammu.
2. Deputy Secretary Industries and Commerce, J&K Govt. New Sectt. Srinagar/Jammu.
3. Deputy Director of Handloom Development Department, J&K, Govt. Janipur Jammu.
4. Assistant Director of Handloom Development Department J&K Govt. Kathua, Distt. Kathua.
5. State of Jammu & Kashmir through Principal Secretary/Commissioner General Department (Administration) New Sectt. Srinagar/Jammu.
6. Tarsem Kumar, S/o Sh. Bodh Raj R/o Village Nonath P.O. Ghagwal Distt. Kathua.

...Respondents  
(Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General)

## **O R D E R (ORAL)**



### **Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**

The Directorate of Handlooms Development, Jammu initiated steps for appointment to the post of Orderly-cum-Chowkidar way back in the year 1999. Through an order dated 17.07.2002, the respondent No.6 was appointed. The applicant filed S.W.P. No.2796/2002 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir at Jammu, challenging the order dated 17.07.2002 by raising several grounds. He has also prayed for a direction to the respondents to appoint him against the said post.

2. In their reply, the respondents stated that the applicant was not found eligible and being more meritorious, the respondent No.6 was chosen.

3. In view of re-organization of the State of Jammu & Kashmir, the S.W.P. has been transferred to this Tribunal and registered as T.A. No.3556/2020.

4. Today, we heard Mr. K K Kundan, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Sudesh Magotra, learned Deputy Advocate General, for the Respondents, through video conferencing.



5. The challenge in the S.W.P. is to an order passed on 17.07.2002 appointing the respondent No.6 as Orderly-cum-Chowkidar. No interim order was passed by the Hon'ble High Court and the result is that for the past 18 years, the respondent No.6 is working as Orderly-cum-Chowkidar. At this length of time, nothing needs to be decided.

6. Accordingly, we dismiss the T.A. as infructuous. There shall be no order as to costs.

**( A K Bishnoi )**  
**Member (A)**

**( Justice L. Narasimha Reddy )**  
**Chairman**

**December 9, 2020**

/sunil/dsn/sd/arun