



**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Jammu Bench, Jammu**

TA No. 5938/2021  
(SWP No. 689/2011)

Wednesday, this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

1. Mohd. Intiaz (Age 33 years)  
S/o Late Farman Ali  
R/o Village Marah  
Tehsil Surankote  
District Poonch.
2. Gurpreet Kour (Age 32 years)  
D/o Swaran Singh  
R/o W.No.8, Mohalla Khorinar  
Poonch.
3. BalwinderKour (Age 34 years)  
D/o Ranjit Singh  
R/o W.No.13, Shesh Mahal  
Poonch.
4. Ghazala Bukhari (Age 32 years)  
D/o Hadayat Shah  
R/o Faisalabad-Surankote  
Poonch.

...Applicant

(Nemo for applicants)

**VERSUS**

1. State of J& K  
Through Commissioner/Secretary  
Department of Education  
Civil Secretariat, Jammu.

Item No. 8



2. Director of School Education  
Jammu.
3. Chief Education Officer  
Poonch.

...Respondents

(Mr.Rajesh Thappa, Deputy Advocate General)

### **ORDER (Oral)**

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

The applicants were selected and appointed as General Line Teachers in the District Poonch, through an order dated 04.08.2007. Stating that they were not paid the salary for the period from 04.08.2007 to 19.02.2008, the applicants filed SWP No.689/2011 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir, with a prayer to direct the respondents No.2, 3 and 4 to release the salary for the period referred to above.

2. The SWP has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of the reorganisation of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and renumbered as T.A. No. 5938/2021.

3. Today, there is no representation for the applicant. We perused the record and heard Mr. Rajesh Thappa, learned Deputy Advocate General.

Item No. 8



4. Learned counsel for respondents submits that the applicants were not taken on duty till 19.02.2008 on account of certain orders passed in the SWP and a detailed reasoned order was passed on 14.06.2016, dealing with the claims of similar nature.

5. The applicants may have been appointed on 04.08.2007. However, they were taken on duty only on 19.02.2008. The respondents contend that the interim orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court were operating during that period.

6. Be that as it may, the respondents passed a detailed order on 14.06.2016, dealing with the claims of this nature pertaining to quite large number of Teachers. If the applicants feel aggrieved by that, they have to pursue the remedies independently.

7. We, therefore, dismiss the T.A., leaving it open to the applicants to pursue the remedies, if any, vis-à-vis the order dated 14.06.2016, in accordance with law.

There shall be no order as to costs.

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

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

**June 30, 2021**  
**/sunil/jyoti/**