



Central Administrative Tribunal Jammu Bench, Jammu

**T.A. No. 4575/2021
(SWP No.1487/2008)**

Tuesday, this the 6th day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Farmida Koser, Age 38 years
W/o. Mohd. Shafi
R/o. Village Dhar Sakri
Tehsil Koteranka
District Rajouri

Applicant
(*Nemo* for applicant)

Versus

1. State of Jammu and Kashmir,
Through Commissioner/Secretary to Government,
Cooperative Department, Civil Secretariat,
Jammu/Srinagar.
2. Chairman,
Service Selection Board, J & K, Jammu/Srinagar
3. Secretary,
Service Selection Board,
J & K, Jammu/Srinagar
4. Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Sofi,
Convenor,
Service Selection Board,
J&K, Jammu/Srinagar

5. Registrar,
Cooperative Societies,
J&K, Jammu/Srinagar

6. Mohd Saleem,
S/o. Jamal Din
R/o. Kote Tehsil Thanamandi
District Rajouri.

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

ORDER (ORAL)

Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The Government issued an advertisement on 21.11.2005 for the post of Junior Supervisor / Sub Auditor. The applicant, 6th respondent and various other candidates responded. Ultimately, the 6th respondent was selected. The applicant filed SWP No.1487/2008 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir, challenging the appointment of 6th respondent and for a direction to the respondents to consider her case for appointment.

2. The respondents filed a detailed counter affidavit. It is stated that though the 6th respondent was selected, his selection was withdrawn at a later point of time and another individual, by name Suria Kosar, was selected and appointed.

3. The SWP has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of re-organization of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and re-numbered as T.A. No.4575/2021.

4. Today, there is no representation for the applicant. We perused the record and heard Mr. Sudesh Magotra, learned Deputy Advocate General.

5. The applicant no doubt has challenged the selection of the 6th respondent, by raising several grounds. The fact, however, remains that selection of the 6th respondent was withdrawn and another candidate was selected and appointed. The applicant has not impleaded the person, who has now been selected in place of 6th respondent. No adjudication can be undertaken at this length of time.

6. We do not find any merit in the T.A. It is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

July 6, 2021
/sunil/rk/