

## Central Administrative Tribunal Jammu Bench, Jammu



T.A. No. 500/2021  
(SWP No. 1027/2016)

Wednesday, this the 07<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

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

1. Bansi Lal (Sg. Ct.) Belt No.696  
s/o Late Chuni Lal  
r/o W. No.01 Bishnah Jammu

2. Manzoor Ahmad Malik  
s/o Mohd Sidiq Malik  
r/o Ganderbal

..Applicants

(*Nemo* for applicants)

VERSUS

1. State of Jammu and Kashmir through  
Commissioner / Secretary to Government  
Home Department, Civil Secretariat, Srinagar

2. Additional Director General of Police,  
Jammu & Kashmir Armed Police,  
Jammu & Kashmir

3. Commandant IRP, 4<sup>th</sup> BN. Channi Himmat Jammu

4. Superintendent Central Jail Srinagar

..Respondents

(Mr. Sudesh Magotra, Deputy Advocate General)

### ORDER (ORAL)

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

The applicants were working as Constables in IRP in 1993.

They were suspended on account of an involvement in a criminal



case, being FIR No.06/2007, wherein Section 302 of RPC was involved. They filed SWP No.1027/2016 before the Hon'ble High Court of Jammu & Kashmir complaining that the subsistence allowance on the basis of recommendations of 6<sup>th</sup> CPC was not being paid to them.

2. The respondents filed separate counter affidavits. They narrated the facts in detail, leading to the suspension of the applicants and the manner in which they were pursuing the remedies. Ultimately, it is stated that the subsistence allowance is being paid to them, in accordance with the revised pay.

3. 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.500/2021.

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

5. The only relief claimed in the SWP is payment of subsistence allowance, which is revised on the basis of the recommendations of 6<sup>th</sup> CPC. The respondents have categorically stated that the subsistence allowance is being paid to them in accordance with the revised pay. Hence, the grievance of the

applicants stands redressed. Nothing remains to be decided at this stage.



6. The T.A. is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**( Anand Mathur )**  
**Member (A)**

**April 7, 2021**  
**/sunil/rk/**

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