

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR**

**WP (C) No. 1493/2023
CM No. 3508/2023**

Reserved On: 18th of February, 2025
Pronounced On: 1st of March, 2025

Farooq Ahmad Janda, Age: 43 Years
S/O Mohammad Sultan Janda
R/O Gousia Colony, Khanyar,
Srinagar.

... Petitioner(s)

Through: -
Mr Gulzar Ahmad Bhat, Advocate.

V/s

1. **Union of India through Secretary,**
Ministry of Communication and Information Technology,
Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General, J&K Postal Circle, Srinagar, 190001.
3. Director, Postal Services, J&K Postal Circle, Srinagar, 190001.
4. Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, J&K Division, Jammu.

... Respondent(s)

Through: -
Mr Nazir Ahmad Bhat, Advocate.

CORAM:

**Hon'ble Mr Justice Sanjeev Kumar, Judge
Hon'ble Mr Justice Puneet Gupta, Judge**

(JUDGMENT)

Sanjeev Kumar-J:

01. The Petitioner-Farooq Ahmad Janda, invokes the extraordinary Writ jurisdiction vested in this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to seek a '*Writ of Certiorari*' for quashing an Order and Judgment dated 16th of March, 2023 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Srinagar Bench ["the Tribunal"] in OA No. 804 of 2020 titled '**Farooq Ahmad Janda v. Union of India & Ors.**'

02. Briefly stated, the facts leading to the filing of this Petition are that the Petitioner came to be appointed as *Safai Karamchari* in the Department of Posts, Government of India on 20th of October, 1999. Indisputably, in terms of the aforesaid Order, the Petitioner was asked to discharge his duties for a period of 0700 hours to 1500 hours, i.e., for a period of 08 hours in the area and places indicated in the said Order. Subsequently, vide Order dated 22nd of August, 2000, issued by the Senior Post Master, under the orders of the Post Master General, Srinagar, all *Safai Karamcharies*, including the Petitioner herein, was posted in RMS office, SRO and Speed Post Office. On 30th of September, 2005, by another Order, the Petitioner was ordered to work as *Farash* in addition to his duties. As is claimed by the Petitioner, he continued to work in the said capacity for almost two decades. He approached the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, by way of Original Application bearing OA No. 062/01008/2017, seeking, *inter alia*, the disposal of his representations made by him for pay parity with the regular employees holding the post of *Safai Karamcharies* as also for regularization of his services. The said OA, vide Order dated 30th of August, 2017, was disposed of with a direction to the Respondents to decide the pending representations of the Petitioner.

03. The Respondents considered the representations filed by the Petitioner and, vide Order dated 9th of February, 2018, impugned in OA No. 804/2020, rejected the claim of the Petitioner for regularization of his services as well as minimum of the pay scale.

04. In OA No. 804/2020, the Petitioner prayed for the grant of following relief(s) in his favour:

- i. “That impugned order dated 9.2.2018, Annexure A-1, may kindly be quashed and set aside being wholly illegal and arbitrary;
- ii. That an appropriate writ/ order/ direction commanding upon the respondents to pay to the applicant minimum of the pay scale as admissible to the regular incumbents *Safai Karamchari/ Safaiwalla/ Sweeper* like other similarly placed employees and extend him all the consequential/ monetary

benefits attached to the post, so as to remove the disparity amongst them. Accordingly, respondents may also be directed to pay the applicant minimum of the pay scale + dearness allowances in accordance with judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India from the date of initial appointment and he also been granted difference of arrears with all consequential benefits along with interest;

- iii. That the respondents may be further directed to regularize the services of the applicant as per Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court judgment dated 2.3.2015 in the case of Union of India & Others vs. Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench & Ors. (CWP No. 9167/CAT/2007);
- iv. That this Hon'ble Tribunal may also pass any other order for the grant of relief to the applicant which it may deem fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case; and
- v. That costs of the application may also be awarded in favour of the applicant."

05. The aforesaid OA was contested by the Respondents by filing their Counter Affidavit. It was the stand taken by the Respondents that the Petitioner was engaged only as a Daily Wager at intervals and has not worked continuously. It was further submitted that the Petitioner, being a Daily Wager, cannot compare his services with the regular Group "D"/ MTS employees, as the two are differently situate and form different class.

06. The matter was considered by the Tribunal in the light of the rival contentions and the material on record. The Tribunal came to the conclusion that there was no evidence available on record to demonstrate that the Petitioner was ever appointed on regular basis to perform the duties of Group "D"/ MTS and, therefore, was not entitled to pay parity with such regular employees. The contention of the Petitioner that he was entitled to pay parity on the principle of "equal pay for equal work" was also rejected, on the ground that equality can be claimed between two equals and not between unequals. Insofar as the prayer of the Petitioner for regularization of his services is concerned, the Tribunal held that in the representations made from time to time, the Petitioner had never sought regularization of

his services. Otherwise also, in the absence of any policy decision by the Respondents and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "**Secretary, State of Karnataka & Ors. v. Umadevi & Ors.**", reported as (2006) 4 SCC 1, followed by "**A. Umarani v. Registrar, Cooperative Societies**", reported as (2004) 7 SCC 112, the employees engaged on daily wage or casual basis, without following due process of recruitment, are not entitled to regularization. The Tribunal, vide the Judgment and Order impugned, dismissed the OA of the Petitioner.

07. Having heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the material on record, we are of the considered opinion that, as is rightly held by the Tribunal, the Petitioner has failed to demonstrate his case for regularization of his services.

08. From the material on record, it is nowhere discernible that the Petitioner was ever engaged after following any due process of recruitment. He came to be picked up and appointed as a *Safai Karamchari* on daily wage basis. It is, however, a fact that he was allowed to continue in service for more than two decades. There is also no dispute with regard to the fact that the Petitioner has, all along, performed the duties which a regularly recruited *Safai Karamchari* performs in the Respondent-Department.

09. As a matter of fact, some of the daily wage *Safai Karamcharies*, who were working with the Petitioner, came to be appointed on permanent basis against available posts. The reply of the Respondents, however, is that the colleagues of the Petitioner were appointed on permanent basis on being selected in a recruitment process. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Partitioner has, all along, performed the same duties which his colleagues, who were earlier working with him on daily wage basis, have been performing even after their regular appointment.

10. In the backdrop of this admitted factual position, there is no merit in the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that, by rendering more than 20 years continuous service on daily wage

basis in the Respondent-Department, the Petitioner has acquired a right of regularization of his services. The engagement of the Petitioner as *Safai Karamchari* on daily wage basis made initially in the year 1999 and continued thereafter was without any due process of recruitment undertaken by the Respondents.

11. True it is that keeping in view the need for the services being rendered by the Petitioner, he was continued in the Respondent Department for almost two decades. However, in view of the legal position laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Constitutional Bench Judgment rendered in **Umadevi's** case (*supra*), followed by **A. Umarani's** case (*supra*), the engagement of the Petitioner cannot be held to be merely an irregular appointment. That being the position and also having regard to the fact that there is no policy of regularization brought to our notice, it is little difficult for us to accede to the prayer of the Petitioner for regularization of his services. The Tribunal has, thus, rightly rejected such a prayer made before it by the Petitioner.

12. We, however, find merit in the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the Petitioner is, at least, entitled to the minimum of the pay scale, without allowances, as is attached and paid to the regularly appointed *Safai Karamcharies*/ Group "D"/ MTS employees working in the Respondent Department. This is so because it is not disputed before us that the type of duties which the Petitioner has been performing for the last more than 20 years are, in any manner, different or inferior than the duties being performed by the regularly appointed *Safai Karamcharies*. We understand that a regularly appointed employee has onerous duties and responsibilities to discharge and, therefore, he is well compensated by payment of various allowances.

13. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in "**State of Punjab & Ors. v. Jagjit Singh & Ors.**", reported as (2017) 1 SCC 148, has already settled the issue and held that a Daily Wager or a temporary employee, performing

the duties akin to the duties performed by a regular employee, is, at least, entitled to the basic pay of the regular post.

14. The issue, which has fallen for consideration before us in this Petition, has already been authoritatively decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jagjit Singh's** case (*supra*). Paragraph Nos. 57 and 58 of the said Judgment read, thus:

“57. There is no room for any doubt, that the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ has emerged from an interpretation of different provisions of the Constitution. The principle has been expounded through a large number of judgments rendered by this Court, and constitutes law declared by this Court. The same is binding on all the courts in India, under Article 141 of the Constitution of India. The parameters of the principle, have been summarized by us in paragraph 42 hereinabove. The principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ has also been extended to temporary employees (differently described as work-charge, daily-wage, casual, ad-hoc, contractual, and the like). The legal position, relating to temporary employees, has been summarized by us, in paragraph 44 hereinabove. The above legal position which has been repeatedly declared, is being reiterated by us, yet again.

58. In our considered view, it is fallacious to determine artificial parameters to deny fruits of labour. An employee engaged for the same work, cannot be paid less than another, who performs the same duties and responsibilities. Certainly not, in a welfare state. Such an action besides being demeaning, strikes at the very foundation of human dignity. Any one, who is compelled to work at a lesser wage, does not do so voluntarily. He does so, to provide food and shelter to his family, at the cost of his self-respect and dignity, at the cost of his self-worth, and at the cost of his integrity. For he knows, that his dependents would suffer immensely, if he does not accept the lesser wage. Any act, of paying less wages, as compared to others similarly situate, constitutes an act of exploitative enslavement, emerging out of a domineering position. Undoubtedly, the action is oppressive, suppressive and coercive, as it compels involuntary subjugation.”

From reading of the aforesaid proposition of law, it clearly comes out that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the parameters for applying the principle of “equal pay for equal work”. The principle of “equal pay for equal work” has also been extended to temporary employees, which include a work charge, a daily wage, casual, *ad hoc* and contractual employees.

15. Further, the legal position has been enunciated and summarized in Paragraph Nos. 42 and 44 of the Judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jagjit Singh's** case (*supra*). With a view to appreciate the legal position better, we deem it appropriate to reproduce Paragraph Nos. 42 and 44 of the aforesaid Judgment as well, hereinbelow:

“42. All the judgments noticed in paragraphs 7 to 24 hereinabove, pertain to employees engaged on regular basis, who were claiming higher wages, under the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’. The claim raised by such employees was premised on the ground, that the duties and responsibilities rendered by them, were against the same post for which a higher pay-scale was being allowed, in other Government departments. Or alternatively, their duties and responsibilities were the same, as of other posts with different designations, but they were placed in a lower scale. Having been painstakingly taken through the parameters laid down by this Court, wherein the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ was invoked and considered, it would be just and appropriate, to delineate the parameters laid down by this Court. In recording the said parameters, we have also adverted to some other judgments pertaining to temporary employees (also dealt with, in the instant judgment), wherein also, this Court had the occasion to express the legal position with reference to the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’. Our consideration, has led us to the following deductions: -

42.1. The ‘onus of proof’, of parity in the duties and responsibilities of the subject post with the reference post, under the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’, lies on the person who claims it. He who approaches the Court has to establish, that the subject post occupied by him, requires him to discharge equal work of equal value, as the reference post (see – the Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology case¹⁰, Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh v. Manju Mathur¹⁵, the Steel Authority of India Limited case¹⁶, and the National Aluminium Company Limited case¹⁸).

42.2. The mere fact that the subject post occupied by the claimant, is in a “different department” vis-a-vis the reference post, does not have any bearing on the determination of a claim, under the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’. Persons discharging identical duties, cannot be treated differently, in the matter of their pay, merely because they belong to different departments of Government (see – the Randhir Singh case and the D.S. Nakara case).

42.3. The principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’, applies to cases of unequal scales of pay, based on no classification or irrational classification (see – the Randhir Singh case). For equal pay, the concerned employees with whom equation is sought, should be performing work, which besides being functionally equal, should be of the same quality and sensitivity (see – the Federation of All India Customs and Central Excise Stenographers (Recognized) case, the Mewa Ram Kanojia case, the Grih Kalyan Kendra Workers’ Union case⁶ and the S.C. Chandra case).

42.4. Persons holding the same rank/designation (in different departments), but having dissimilar powers, duties and responsibilities, can be placed in different scales of pay, and cannot claim the benefit of the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' (see – the Randhir Singh case¹, State of Haryana v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association⁹, and the Hukum Chand Gupta case¹⁷). Therefore, the principle would not be automatically invoked, merely because the subject and reference posts have the same nomenclature.

42.5. In determining equality of functions and responsibilities, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', it is necessary to keep in mind, that the duties of the two posts should be of equal sensitivity, and also, qualitatively similar. Differentiation of pay-scales for posts with difference in degree of responsibility, reliability and confidentiality, would fall within the realm of valid classification, and therefore, pay differentiation would be legitimate and permissible (see – the Federation of All India Customs and Central Excise Stenographers (Recognized) case and the State Bank of India case). The nature of work of the subject post should be the same and not less onerous than the reference post. Even the volume of work should be the same. And so also, the level of responsibility. If these parameters are not met, parity cannot be claimed under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' (see - State of U.P. v. J.P. Chaurasia, and the Grih Kalyan Kendra Workers' Union case).

42.6. For placement in a regular pay-scale, the claimant has to be a regular appointee. The claimant should have been selected, on the basis of a regular process of recruitment. An employee appointed on a temporary basis, cannot claim to be placed in the regular pay-scale (see – the Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology case).

42.7. Persons performing the same or similar functions, duties and responsibilities, can also be placed in different pay-scales. Such as 'selection grade', in the same post. But this difference must emerge out of a legitimate foundation, such as – merit, or seniority, or some other relevant criteria (see - State of U. P. v. J. P. Chaurasia.)

42.8. If the qualifications for recruitment to the subject post vis-a- vis the reference post are different, it may be difficult to conclude, that the duties and responsibilities of the posts are qualitatively similar or comparable (see – the Mewa Ram Kanojia case, and Government of W. B. v. Tarun K. Roy). In such a cause, the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', cannot be invoked.

42.9. The reference post, with which parity is claimed, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', has to be at the same hierarchy in the service, as the subject post. Pay-scales of posts may be different, if the hierarchy of the posts in question, and their channels of promotion, are different. Even if the duties and responsibilities are same, parity would not be permissible, as against a superior post, such as a promotional post (see - Union of India v. Pradip Kumar Dey⁷, and the Hukum Chand Gupta case).

42.10. A comparison between the subject post and the reference post, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', cannot be made, where the subject post and the reference post are in different establishments, having a different management. Or even, where the establishments are in different geographical locations, though owned by the same master (see – the Harbans Lal case²³). Persons engaged differently, and being paid out of different funds, would not be entitled to pay parity (see - Official Liquidator v. Dayanand).

42.11. Different pay-scales, in certain eventualities, would be permissible even for posts clubbed together at the same hierarchy in the cadre. As for instance, if the duties and responsibilities of one of the posts are more onerous, or are exposed to higher nature of operational work/risk, the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' would not be applicable. And, also when, the reference post includes the responsibility to take crucial decisions, and that is not so for the subject post (see – the State Bank of India case).

42.12. The priority given to different types of posts, under the prevailing policies of the Government, can also be a relevant factor for placing different posts under different pay-scales. Herein also, the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' would not be applicable (see - State of Haryana v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association).

42.13. The parity in pay, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', cannot be claimed, merely on the ground, that at an earlier point of time, the subject post and the reference post, were placed in the same pay- scale. The principle of 'equal pay for equal work' is applicable only when it is shown, that the incumbents of the subject post and the reference post, discharge similar duties and responsibilities (see - State of West Bengal v. West Bengal Minimum Wages Inspectors Association).

42.14. For parity in pay-scales, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', equation in the nature of duties, is of paramount importance. If the principal nature of duties of one post is teaching, whereas that of the other is non-teaching, the principle would not be applicable. If the dominant nature of duties of one post is of control and management, whereas the subject post has no such duties, the principle would not be applicable. Likewise, if the central nature of duties of one post is of quality control, whereas the subject post has minimal duties of quality control, the principle would not be applicable (see - Union Territory Administration, Chandigarh v. Manju Mathur).

42.15. There can be a valid classification in the matter of pay-scales, between employees even holding posts with the same nomenclature i.e., between those discharging duties at the headquarters, and others working at the institutional/sub-office level (see – the Hukum Chand Gupta case), when the duties are qualitatively dissimilar.

42.16. The principle of 'equal pay for equal work' would not be applicable, where a differential higher pay-scale is extended to persons discharging the same duties and holding the same

designation, with the objective of ameliorating stagnation, or on account of lack of promotional avenues (see – the Hukum Chand Gupta case).

42.17. Where there is no comparison between one set of employees of one organization, and another set of employees of a different organization, there can be no question of equation of pay-scales, under the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', even if two organizations have a common employer. Likewise, if the management and control of two organizations, is with different entities, which are independent of one another, the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' would not apply (see – the S. C. Chandra case, and the National Aluminium Company Limited case).

43.

44. We shall first outline the conclusions drawn in cases where a claim for pay parity, raised at the hands of the concerned temporary employees, was accepted by this Court, by applying the principle of 'equal pay for equal work', with reference to regular employees: -

44.1. In the Dhirendra Chamoli case, this Court examined a claim for pay parity raised by temporary employees, for wages equal to those being disbursed to regular employees. The prayer was accepted. The action of not paying the same wage, despite the work being the same, was considered as violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. It was held, that the action amounted to exploitation – in a welfare state committed to a socialist pattern of society.

44.2. In the Surinder Singh case, this Court held, that the right of equal wages claimed by temporary employees emerged, inter alia, from Article 39 of the Constitution. The principle of 'equal pay for equal work' was again applied, where the subject employee had been appointed on temporary basis, and the reference employee was borne on the permanent establishment. The temporary employee was held entitled to wages drawn by an employee on the regular establishment. In this judgment, this Court also took note of the fact, that the above proposition was affirmed by a Constitution Bench of this Court, in the D. S. Nakara case.

44.3. In the Bhagwan Dass case, this Court recorded, that in a claim for equal wages, the duration for which an employee would remain (- or had remained) engaged, would not make any difference. So also, the manner of selection and appointment would make no difference. And therefore, whether the selection was made on the basis of open competition or was limited to a cluster of villages, was considered inconsequential, insofar as the applicability of the principle is concerned. And likewise, whether the appointment was for a fixed limited duration (six months, or one year), or for an unlimited duration, was also considered inconsequential, insofar as the applicability of the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' is concerned. It was held, that the claim for equal wages would be sustainable, where an employee is required to discharge similar duties and responsibilities as regular employees, and the concerned employee possesses the qualifications prescribed for the post. In the above case, this Court rejected the contention advanced on behalf of

the Government, that the plea of equal wages by the employees in question, was not sustainable because the concerned employees were engaged in a temporary scheme, and against posts which were sanctioned on a year to year basis.

44.4. In the Daily Rated Casual Labour Employed under P&T Department through Bhartiya Dak Tar Mazdoor Manch case²² this Court held, that under principle flowing from Article 38(2) of the Constitution, Government could not deny a temporary employee, at least the minimum wage being paid to an employee in the corresponding regular cadre, along with dearness allowance and additional dearness allowance, as well as, all the other benefits which were being extended to casual workers. It was also held, that the classification of workers (as unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled), doing the same work, into different categories, for payment of wages at different rates, was not tenable. It was also held, that such an act of an employer, would amount to exploitation. And further that, the same would be arbitrary and discriminatory, and therefore, violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

44.5. In *State of Punjab v. Devinder Singh*, this Court held, that daily- wagers were entitled to be placed in the minimum of the pay-scale of regular employees, working against the same post. The above direction was issued after accepting, that the concerned employees, were doing the same work as regular incumbents holding the same post, by applying the principle of 'equal pay for equal work'.

44.6. In the *Secretary, State of Karnataka* case, a Constitution Bench of this Court, set aside the judgment of the High Court, and directed that daily-wagers be paid salary equal to the lowest grade of salary and allowances being paid to regular employees. Importantly, in this case, this Court made a very important distinction between pay parity and regularization. It was held that the concept of equality would not be applicable to issues of absorption/regularization. But, the concept was held as applicable, and was indeed applied, to the issue of pay parity – if the work component was the same. The judgment rendered by the High Court, was modified by this Court, and the concerned daily-wage employees were directed to be paid wages, equal to the salary at the lowest grade of the concerned cadre.

44.7. In *State of Haryana v. Charanjit Singh*, a three-Judge bench of this Court held, that the decisions rendered by this Court in *State of Haryana v. Jasmer Singh*, *State of Haryana v. Tilak Raj*, the *Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology* case and *Government of W.B. v. Tarun K. Roy*, laid down the correct law. Thereupon, this Court declared, that if the concerned daily-wage employees could establish, that they were performing equal work of equal quality, and all other relevant factors were fulfilled, a direction by a Court to pay such employees equal wages (from the date of filing the writ petition), would be justified.

44.8. In *State of U.P. v. Putti Lal*, based on decisions in several cases (wherein the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' had been invoked), it was held, that a daily-wager discharging similar duties, as those engaged on regular basis, would be entitled

to draw his wages at the minimum of the pay-scale (drawn by his counterpart, appointed on regular basis), but would not be entitled to any other allowances or increments.

44.9. In the Uttar Pradesh Land Development Corporation case³³ this Court noticed, that the respondents were employed on contract basis, on a consolidated salary. But, because they were actually appointed to perform the work of the post of Assistant Engineer, this Court directed the employer to pay the respondents wages, in the minimum of the pay-scales ascribed for the post of Assistant Engineer.”

When we analyze the facts of the instant case in the light of the law laid down in **Jagjit Singh’s** case (*supra*), we find that the Petitioner is fully covered by the observations of the Hon’ble Supreme Court made in Paragraph Nos. 57 and 58. The Petitioner, who was engaged for the work, cannot be paid less than the ones who perform the same duties and responsibilities, may be while working on regular basis. In the instant case, as noticed above, some of the *Safai Karamcharies*, who were working along with the Petitioner on daily wage basis, were regularly appointed by the Respondents, albeit after proper selection process, are receiving a regular pay scale. The Petitioner, who has been performing the same duties as are being performed by the aforesaid *Safai Karamcharies*, now working on permanent basis in the graded pay scale, cannot be denied the basic of the pay scale of the lowest grade of *Safai Karamcharies*.

16. For the aforesaid reasons, we allow this Petition partially and hold the Petitioner entitled to the basic pay in the lowest grade, as is available to the *Safai Karamcharies*/ Group “D”/ MTS employees working in the Respondent Department. This benefit shall be available to the Petitioner w.e.f. the date the first OA bearing No. 062/01008/2017 was filed by him before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench. The Respondents shall comply with the directions aforesaid and work out and pay the arrears thereof to the Petitioner within two months from the date a copy of this Judgment is served upon them. They shall do well to pay to the Petitioner immediately and forthwith the basic pay of the post of *Safai*

Karamcharies/ Group “D”/ MTF employees. The impugned Order passed by the Tribunal shall stand modified to the said extent, accordingly.

17. Writ Petition is, accordingly, **disposed** of on the above terms, along with the connected CM(s).

(Puneet Gupta)
Judge

(Sanjeev Kumar)
Judge

SRINAGAR
March 1st, 2025
“TAHIR”

i. Whether the Judgment is approved for reporting? **Yes.**

