

76
Supp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

WP(C) 2568/2026 CM(6986/2026)

RAM BHAROSE MEENA Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. S A Makroo, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Rahil Noor, Adv.

V/s

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Faizan, CGC
vice Mr. T M Shamshi, DSGI.

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajnesh Oswal, Judge

ORDER
14.10.2026

1. The petitioner was transferred to Kargil in the year 2024 which is a high-altitude area. As per the Policy, if an employee serves at a high altitude, a right is accrued to him to secure next place of posting of his choice. The petitioner opted Rishikesh as his next place of posting. In terms of order dated 24.04.2026, the petitioner was initially transferred to Rishikesh and on the very next date i.e, 25.04.2026, his place of posting was altered from Rishikesh to Guwhati. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his place of posting was altered solely in order to accommodate respondent No. 9.

2. The petitioner, aggrieved of alteration of his place of posting, preferred a representation with the respondents, which was never considered, and that prompted the petitioner to file writ petition bearing WP(C) No. 1409/2026, which was disposed of by this Court on 29.06.2026 by directing the respondents to accord consideration to the representation of the petitioner and decide the same strictly in accordance with the norms and the policy in vogue governing the transfer of the employee of Border Roads Organization with a period of two weeks. The order passed by this Court was served upon the respondents on 02nd July 2026.
3. Mr. S. A Makroo, learned Senior Counsel submits that the order dated 16.06.2026 has been passed by an incompetent officer. He further submits that the order dated 16.06.2026 is in violation of the order passed by this Court. In order to buttress his arguments, he has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled *Ghanshyam Sarda Vs. Sashikant Jha*.
4. Heard and perused the record.
5. In terms of order dated 12.10.2026, learned counsel for the respondents was directed to file short affidavit. However,

order dated 10.10.2026 has been produced before this Court in terms of which the petitioner was relieved on 10.10.2026.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous with liberty to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy as is available under law.

SRINAGAR

14.10.2026

Aasif



Whether the order is speaking Yes/No

Whether the order is reportable Yes/No