

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC(T) No.12 of 2025

Decided on: 9th July, 2026

Ranjit Singh

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

Sh. Amarjeet Singh and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Anshul Jairath, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General
with Ms. Seema Sharma, Deputy
Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Petitioner is with the grievance that the respondents have violated order dated 04.08.2017 passed by the erstwhile learned H.P. Administrative Tribunal in O.A. No.3915 of 2017. The said order reads as under:-

“However, in the facts and circumstances and documents filed alongwith the original application, there shall be a direction in the interim to the respondents/competent authority to maintain status quo qua the applicant, who is presently working as Part Time Worker (Class-IV) in Patwar Circle Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, till further orders.”

¹ Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of the aforesaid order, respondents/competent authority(s) were to maintain status quo qua the applicant, who was working as Part Time Worker (Class-IV) in Patwar Circle Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, till further orders. The grievance projected is that the respondents have not maintained the status quo qua the petitioner. He is not being allowed to work as Part Time Worker (Class-IV) in Patwar Circle Sujanpur.

3. The respondents in their reply have taken the stand that the petitioner was never appointed as Part Time Worker at the patwar circle in question. No emoluments were ever paid to him. That on 08.07.2015, administrative approval was conveyed by the Additional Chief Secretary-cum-Financial Commissioner (Revenue) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh for creation/filling up 1791 posts of Part Time Workers in the State of Himachal Pradesh including District Hamirpur. Selection process was accordingly initiated and advertisement was issued for filling up 178 posts of Part Time Workers in District Hamirpur, out of which, 21 posts were filled up, but on account of order dated 04.08.2017 passed in O.A. No.3915 of 2017, post of Part Time Worker in Patwar Circle

Sujanpur has not been filled in. The said post is still lying vacant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, disputes the assertions of the respondents and submits that the petitioner has filed a rejoinder to the reply of respondent No.1, appending therewith some documents, more particularly at page 54 of the paper book, dated 29.05.2017, wherein the Village Revenue Officer Sujanpur, District Hamirpur has referred the petitioner as temporary Chowkidar.

5. It appears that the order dated 04.08.2017 was passed on the first date of listing of the matter on the assertion of the petitioner that he was working as Part Time Worker (Class-IV) in the patwar circle in question. Accordingly, the respondents/competent authority(s) were directed to maintain status quo qua the applicant. The documents appended with the original application (now CWPOA), which is also listed alongwith the present contempt petition, more particularly Annexure A-1, issued by the Village Revenue Officer, refers the petitioner as serving without any emoluments. It needs to be emphasized that the petitioner is putting forth the case that he is serving as Part Time Worker (Class-IV). If he is not being

paid any emolument, his continuation on the post as asserted by him, comes under cloud and needs to be determined in the CWPOA.

In view of the factual stand taken by the respondents that the petitioner had never worked as Part Time Worker (Class-IV) at Patwar Circle Sujanpur; he had never been paid any emoluments in that capacity and also acknowledging that the respondents have kept the post of Part Time Worker at the patwar circle in question vacant pursuant to the order dated 04.08.2017 passed in O.A. No.3915 of 2017, there cannot be said to be any contempt on part of the respondents in the given facts and circumstances of the case. The contempt petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand dismissed.

July 09, 2026
Mukesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge