



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Jammu Bench, Jammu**

O.A. No. 226/2020

Wednesday, this the 14th day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Neha Jamwal, age 55 years,
W/o Sh. Sunil Singh Jamwal,
R/o F-392, Opposite State Motor Garage,
New Plot, Jammu.

...Applicant

(Mr. Imtiaz Hussain for Mr. Rakesh Sharma, Advocate)

Versus

1. Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir,
Through Commissioner/Secretary,
Information Department,
Govt. of J&K, Civil Secretariat,
Jammu/Srinagar.
 2. Director Information Department,
Jammu
 3. Administrative Officer,
Information Department,
Jammu
 4. Nana Tufchi,
Assistant Information Officer,
C/o Department of Information
 5. Ghulam Jeelani,
Assistant Information Officer,
C/o Department of Information
 6. Shabir Ahmad,
Assistant Information Officer,
C/o Department of Information
- ... Respondents

(Mr. Sudesh Mangotra, Deputy Advocate General)



ORDER (ORAL)

Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant is working as a Store Keeper in the Directorate of Information, Jammu, the 2nd respondent herein. The Government framed the Jammu & Kashmir Information Department (Subordinate) Service Recruitment Rules, 2015 vide SRO 123 dated 13.04.2015. According to the applicant, the Rules did not provide for promotion from the post of Store Keeper, whereas other similarly situated posts are provided with the promotional avenues.

2. She filed this O.A. with a prayer to quash SRO 123 dated 13.04.2015 insofar as it did not provide the promotional avenues for the post of Store Keeper and to re-designate the Store Keeper as equivalent to Senior Assistant, as was mentioned in SRO 69 dated 02.04.1993. The consequential benefits are also claimed.

3. The applicant contends that the rule making authority did not take into account, the fact that the post of Store Keeper is left without any promotional avenues and the same



amounts to discrimination and arbitrariness. Comparison is also sought to be drawn with various posts.

4. The respondents filed a detailed counter affidavit opposing the OA. According to them, the Rules were framed, duly taking into account, the structure of the establishment and the promotional avenues were also provided, depending upon the cadre strength at various levels as well as the qualifications required for the post.

5. Today, we heard Mr. Mr. Imtiaz Hussain for Mr. Rakesh Sharma, learned counsel for applicant and Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General.

6. The applicant challenges the Rules framed under SRO No.123, insofar as they did not provide any promotional avenues for the post of Store Keeper. This is not an issue pertaining to one or two individuals. The entire establishment of Store Keepers, not only in the 2nd respondent organisation but also in other establishments, needs to be taken into account. Any step taken in one Department would have its own cascading effect on other Departments and posts. Well-informed and well-considered



decision needs to be taken in this behalf. The respondents stated that the issue is being dealt with, at various levels.

7. We, therefore, dispose of the O.A., leaving it open to the applicant to make a representation by herself, or through any Association, and the respondents, in turn, shall examine the same with reference to the relevant provisions of law, and pass orders within a period of four months from the date on which the representation is received. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed) (Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Member (A) Chairman

July 14, 2021
/sunil/rk/daya/