

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

CCP(S) No. 80/2025 in
SWP No. 28/2016

Pronounced on: 25.11.2025
Uploaded on: 01.12.2025

Suraj Parkash

.....Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Abhishek Wazir, Advocate
Vs

Santosh D. Vaidya and others

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Ms. Priyanka Bhat, Advocate vice
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG
Mr. Eishaan Dadhichi, CGSC vice
Mr. Vishal Sharma, DSGI
Mr. Vinayak Phull, Advocate

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAVED IQBAL WANI, JUDGE

ORDER (ORAL)

1. In the instant contempt petition, the petitioner has alleged non-compliance of judgment and order dated 15.10.2024 passed in SWP No. 28/2016, in terms whereof, while treating the rejection order dated 24.08.2018 challenged by the petitioner repudiating the claims of the petitioner by the respondents as inconsequential and ineffective, the respondents came to be directed to pass fresh order in compliance of the judgment referred therein by placing the petitioner in the relevant pay scale in terms of SRO 18 of 1998 dated 19.01.1998 and SRO 93 of 2009 dated 15.04.2009 and also to pay the differential arrears to the petitioner.
2. A compliance report has been filed by the respondents on 15.11.2025 accompanied with a consideration order dated 12.11.2025, wherein, it is being, inter alia, stated that the petitioner has already been extended the benefits of revised pay pursuant to SRO 18 of 1998 issued by the

Government, applicable to the Government servants and subsequently made applicable to the employees of the Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) including the respondents-Corporation vide Government order No. 47-F of 1998 dated 19.01.1998 w.e.f. 01.01.1996 and that the petitioner consequently came to be extended the benefits thereof, along with other employees and a necessary entry in this regard as well, came to be made at page 13 of the service book of the petitioner.

It is further stated in the order 12.11.2025 (supra) that in terms of SRO 93 of 2009, 6th Pay Commission recommendations were made applicable to the Government employees and in furtherance thereof, same came to be made applicable to the employees of Public Sector Undertakings including the respondent-Corporation w.e.f. 01.07.2009 and in furtherance whereof, the said benefit came to be allowed to the employees of the Corporation including the petitioner herein w.e.f. 01.04.2012 and a necessary entry in this regard as well came to be made at page 17 of the service book of the petitioner in the year 2009 itself.

3. The Counsel for the respondents, while making his submissions in line with the compliance report (supra) as also the aforesaid consideration order, also produced the original service book of the petitioner wherein the aforesaid stand taken by the respondents is authenticated.
4. Having regard to the directions contained in the judgment and order, non-compliance of which has been complained of, in the instant contempt petition, as also the compliance report (supra) including the aforesaid consideration order, seemingly the respondents have complied with the judgment and order.

5. Under these circumstances, contempt notice issued is recalled and proceedings are closed.
6. The original service book of the petitioner produced by the counsel for the respondents is returned back in the open Court. Furthermore, the bailable warrants issued against the respondents/contemnors are recalled.

7. *Disposed of.*

(Javed Iqbal Wani)
Judge

Jammu
25.11.2025
Diksha

Whether the order is reportable: Yes/No

Whether the order is speaking: Yes/No

