



CGHC010337752026



2026:CGHC:38840


NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONT No. 1237 of 2026

Jagmohan Singh Rathiya S/o Gandaram Rathiya Aged About 67 Years R/o Post Chandrashekharapur (Edu), Tah And P.S. Chhal, Distt- Raigarh C.G.496665

... **Petitioner(s)**



versus

1 - Mr. Vinod Kumar Arora Chairman Cum, Appellate Authority. Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Plot No. 47, Sector -24, Atal Nagar Naya Raipur Distt -Raipur (C.G.) Pin Code 492018

2 - Mr. Ravindra Pal Singh Jaat General Manager (Administration) Cum Disciplinary Authority Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Plot No. 47, Sector -24, Atal Nagar Naya Raipur Distt -Raipur (C.G.) Pin Code 492018

... **Respondent(s)**

(Cause title taken from)

For Petitioner(s) : Shri K.N. Nande, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

02.09.2026

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 22.06.2026 passed by this Court in W.P.(S) No.6461/2025.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite the aforesaid order, the respondents have not taken any initiative in respect of continuity of service and other consequential benefits. It is further submitted that instead of implementing the order, the respondents have initiated a fresh departmental enquiry vide order dated 20.07.2026.
3. This Court has considered the submissions and perused the order dated 22.06.2026 passed in WPS No. 6461/2025.
4. A plain reading of paragraph 20 of the said order shows that, while quashing the orders of punishment, this Court expressly granted liberty to the respondent authorities to initiate enquiry proceedings against the petitioner in accordance with law from the stage at which the earlier proceedings had got vitiated. From document Annexure C/2 filed by the petitioner himself, it is manifest that the fresh enquiry has already been initiated vide order dated 20.07.2026 and the same is going on and as such, at this

juncture, it cannot be said that the authorities are defying the order of this Court.

5. So far as the retiral dues and other consequential benefits are concerned, the judgment dated 22.06.2026 did not prescribe any specific time-limit for their release. Further, the issue of back-wages was specifically left to be considered by the respondent authorities separately, in accordance with law.
6. In these circumstances, the grievances raised by the petitioner may give rise to an appropriate substantive remedy, but the material on record does not establish clear, wilful and deliberate disobedience of the order dated 22.06.2026.
7. Accordingly, no case for contempt is made out. The contempt petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE