



## Central Administrative Tribunal Jammu Bench, Jammu

T.A. No. 5303/2021  
(S.W.P. No.1623/2009)

Wednesday, this the 5<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

Mandeep Singh, age 24 years  
s/o Sh. Narinder Singh  
r/o Village Kotlil Shah Daula (Khutian)  
Teh. R S Pura, Distt. Jammu

..Applicant

(*Nemo* for applicant)

VERSUS

1. State of J & K through Commissioner /Secretary to Govt. Home Department, Civil Secretariat, Jammu
2. Service Selection Committee of Police Department for Selection of Wireless Operators Year 2009 Through Chairman Sh. K Rajindra, at present Add DG CID, Police Headquarters, Srinagar
3. Director General of Police J & K, PHQ Srinagar
4. Arvind Sharma s/o Sh. Harbans Lal  
r/o Badyal Brahmna Teh. R S Pura, Distt. Jammu
5. Jasvinder Singh s/o Sh. Surjeet Singh  
r/o Khrpind, R S Pura, Jammu
6. Deepak Sharma s/o Bodh Raj Sharma  
r/o Rohi Morh Gadigarh  
Teh & Distt Jammu
7. Mukesh s/o Makhan Lal  
r/o Dadigarh, Teh. & Distt. Jammu
8. Parveen Kumar s/o Sh. Ram Lal  
r/o Choala R S Pura, Distt. Jammu

..Respondents

(Mr. Rajesh Thappa, Deputy Advocate General)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

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

The T.A. arises out of SWP No.1623/2009 filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir, wherein the applicant has challenged the selection of respondent Nos. 4 to 8 as Wireless Operators in the Police Establishment and to direct the respondents to constitute separate Selection Board for selection of candidates for the said post.

2. The SWP has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of reorganization of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and renumbered as T.A. No.5303/2021.

3. The case was listed on earlier occasions and there was no representation for the applicant. Today also, there is no representation for him. Therefore, we perused the record and heard Mr. Rajesh Thappa, learned Deputy Advocate General.

4. The selection took place way back in the year 2009. The grounds pleaded by the applicant in challenging the selection of respondent Nos. 4 to 8 are almost imaginary. It is not his case that he secured better merit than the selected candidates. If the selection process itself is not in accordance with law, the applicant was required to challenge that before he participated in

the process. He cannot challenge the same after it emerged that he was not selected.



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

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

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

**May 5, 2021**  
/sunil/jyoti/sd/