

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Jammu Bench, Jammu**



T.A. No.6357/2020  
S.W.P. No.938/2004

Tuesday, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Nadeem Ahmed, Aged 23 years,  
S/o Mohd. Rafiq,  
R/o Village Rakhi Ban Nadian,  
Tehsil Thanamandi,  
District Rajouri.

..Applicant

(Through Mr. M. R. Qureshi, Advocate)

VERSUS

1. State of J& K through,  
Commissioner Secretary to Govt., Revenue Deptt.,  
Civil Sectt., Srinagar/Jammu.
2. Tehsildar Thanamandi,  
District Rajouri.
3. Zonal Education Officer, Darhal,  
Tehsil Thanamandi,  
District Rajouri.

..Respondents

(Through Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:**



The applicant filed SWP No. 938/2004, for issuing a Writ of Mandamus before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu and Kashmir, and directing the respondents for issuance of a permanent resident certificate on the basis of the recommendation made vide Annexures F to N, and to recall the order dated 17.11.2003, through which the applicant was not allowed to work in the Primary School, Naka Nadian, and to direct the respondents to take further steps in this behalf.

2. The applicant was working as Teacher on temporary basis. His effort was to get regularized. The applicant raised several contentions as regards denial of permanent status and other connected steps.

3. The respondents filed a counter affidavit making their stand clear.

4. The SWP has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of the reorganization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and renumbered as TA No. 6357/2020.

5. We heard Mr. M. R. Qureshi, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General.

6. The necessity for us to deal with the matter in detail is obviated on account of the fact that the applicant was appointed as Teacher on regular basis, during the pendency of the Writ Petition, on 14.07.2014. Ever since then the applicant I working on regular basis, thereby the substantial part of his grievance is redressed.



7. Mr. M.R.Qureshi, the learned counsel for the applicant, submits that his client was entitled to be regularized with effect from the year 2004. Basically, we cannot address this issue since it was not part of the prayer in the Writ Petition. Secondly, the applicant can make a representation in that behalf, duly enclosing the relevant proceedings or notifications.

8. We, therefore, dispose of this TA, taking on record the fact that the applicant has already been appointed as Teacher on regular basis in the year 2014 and leaving it open to him to make a representation, if any part of the grievance still exists. There shall be no order as to costs.

**( Mohd. Jamshed )**  
**Member (A)**

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

*/vinita/jyoti/ankit/dsn*