

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

WP(C) No. 3173/2023 c/w
WP (C) No. 848/2024 a/w
Connected matters

Union of India & others

.....Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Vishal Sharma, Sr. Advocate (DSGI) with
Mr. Eishaan Dadhichi, CGSC
Mr. L.K Moza, CGSC
Mr. Ranjit S. Jamwal, CGSC
Mr. Vikas Sharma, CGSC
Mr. Prem Sadotra, CGSC
Mr. Rohan Nanda, CGSC

vs

Nirman Singh Jamwal

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Rajnish Raina, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Prabhat Sangotra, Advocate
Mr. B.S. Sarmal, Advocate
Mr. Amit Singh, Advocate
Mr. P.L Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Yogesh Rana, Advocate
Mr. Rishu Rajeshwar, Advocate
Mr. Om Goswami, Advocate

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE

ORDER
19.09.2025

**WP(C) No. 3173/2023, WP(C) Nos. 233/234/301/316/387/421/439/526/706/
1000/1007/1036/1094/1095/1096/1097/1184/1218/1219/1239/1242/1258/1279/
1319/1365/1504/1617/1644/1653/1694/1708/1892/2018/2022/2068/2275/2298/
2301/2572/2594/2612/2613 of 2024 & WP(C) Nos. /540/544/657/658 of 2025**

1. Heard in part.
2. List for continuation on **24.09.2025**.

WP(C) No. 848/2024

1. The issue raised by Mr. Vishal Sharma, learned DSGI in this matter is fully covered and decided by the Supreme Court in the case titled as "*Pani Ram vs. Union of India & others (2021) 9 S.C.R. 1024*". Relying upon the aforesaid judgment, this Court also dismissed similar writ petitions i.e., WP(C) No. 2456/2024 titled "Union of India & Others Vs. Ex. N.K Babu

Ram” on 20.08.2025 and WP(C) No. 2794/2024 titled “Union of India & Others Vs. Bansi Lal” on 16.09.2025.

2. We have gone through the impugned judgment passed by the Tribunal and are of the considered opinion that the case of the respondent is fully covered by the judgment of **Pani Ram** (supra) and, therefore, no more plea is required to be entertained in the matter. The judgment passed by the Tribunal, which is impugned before us, is in tune with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the aforementioned case and, therefore, does not call for any interference by this Court.
3. This petition is found to be devoid of any merit and is, accordingly, *dismissed*.

Jammu
19.09.2025
Rahul

