



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Jammu Bench, Jammu**

T.A. No.4666/2021
(CPSW No.225/2012 in SWP No.349/2010)

Thursday, this the 27th day of May, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Tarun Shridhar, Member (A)

Altaf Ahmad Wani s/o Ghulam Hassan Wani
r/o Chatapora Pulwama

... Applicant

(Nemo for applicant)

Versus

1. Dr. Saleem-ur-Rehman, Director,
Health Services Kashmir
2. Mr. Shokat Ahmad Laloo, Chief Medical Officer,
Pulwama

... Respondents

(Mr. Rajesh Thappa, Deputy Advocate General)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant filed SWP No.349/2010 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir, claiming the relief of regularization. It was pleaded that he was initially engaged as daily wager for a period of 89 days in the year 1996 and that he was continued thereafter. The SWP was disposed of on 03.03.2010, directing the respondents to consider the case of

Item No.16



the applicant on par with other similarly candidates within four weeks. Alleging that the respondents did not comply with the order passed in SWP, the applicant filed CPSW No.225/2012 before the Hon'ble High Court.

2. The respondents filed a detailed counter affidavit. It is stated that an order was passed on 23.06.2012 after a detailed consideration of the case and thereby, the direction issued in SWP by the Hon'ble High Court stood complied with.

3. The CPSW has since been transferred to the Tribunal in view of reorganization of the State of Jammu & Kashmir and renumbered as T.A. No.4666/2021.

4. Today, there is no representation for the applicant and we heard Mr. Rajesh Thappa, learned Deputy Advocate General.

5. The only relief granted by the Hon'ble High Court in the SWP was to consider the case of the applicant for regularization. Being under the impression that his case was not considered, the applicant filed this CPSW. The fact, however, remains that a detailed order was passed by the respondents on 23.06.2012 itself, rejecting the case of the applicant. Therefore, it cannot be said that there was any default on the part of the respondents.

Item No.16



6. The TA/CPSW is accordingly closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Tarun Shridhar)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

May 27, 2021
/sunil/jyoti/ns/sd/