

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

CCP(S) No. 309/2025 in
SWP No. 2124/2011

Sharista Devi

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

Through :- Ms. Surinder Kour, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Michael Singh Dogra, Advocate
V/s

Govind Mohan and others

....Respondent(s)

Through :- Mr. Eishaan Dadhichi, CGSC vice
Mr. Vishal Sharma, DSGI

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE WASIM SADIQ NARGAL, JUDGE

ORDER
24.07.2026

1. The instant contempt petition arises out of the order dated 16.05.2024 passed by the learned writ court, by virtue of which the writ petition preferred by the petitioner was disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondents along with the evidence relating to the re-marriage of the respondent No. 6 and other related conditions that would disentitle her to family pension. Para 8 of the order dated 16.05.2024, which for the facility of reference, is reproduced as under :

*“8. In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the writ petition is **disposed of** with liberty to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondents along with the evidence relating to the re-marriage of respondent No.6 and other related conditions that would disentitle her to family pension. If and when such a representation is made by the petitioner before the respondents, the same shall be dealt with in accordance with law.”*

2. Compliance report stands filed on behalf of the respondents on 13.11.2025, in which the respondents have taken a specific stand that the order/judgment passed by the learned writ court stands complied with and a detailed consideration order dated 04.11.2025 has been passed, rejecting the representation preferred by the petitioner dated 19.02.2025. A perusal of the consideration order dated 04.11.2025 reveals that the representation submitted by the petitioner on 19.02.2025 and the pension rules have been thoroughly examined by the competent authority on the basis of the representation submitted by the petitioner-Smt. Sharista Devi and it has also been observed that no such provision has been submitted by the petitioner under which the pension of the respondent No. 6, i.e., Smt. Reena Kumari can be stopped and the said pension can be made payable to Smt. Sharista Devi. In the aforesaid backdrop, the representation submitted by the Smt. Sharista Devi on 19.02.2025 was rejected vide the detailed consideration order mentioned supra.

3. Thus, in light of the stand taken by the respondents coupled with the detailed consideration order, this Court is of the view that the order/judgment passed by the learned writ court stands complied with and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping this contempt petition alive. Accordingly, proceedings in the instant contempt petition are closed. Rule if any shall stand discharged. However, disposal of the instant contempt petition shall not come in the way of the petitioner to challenge the aforesaid order of consideration, if so advised, by way of appropriate proceedings.

4. ***Disposed of*** as above.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)
Judge

Jammu:
24.07.2026
Pawan Angotra