



2026:UHC:4857

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 1536 of 2026

16 June, 2026

Rajveer Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. M.K. Ray and Mr. Harsh Taneja, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

Petitioner has challenged the order dated 24.12.2025, passed by respondent no.4, annexure-11 to the writ petition, whereby claim of the petitioner for payment of arrears of salary for the months of August, September, October and November, 2018 was refused.

2. The challenge thrown by petitioner in the present writ petition for impugning the order has a brief background, narrated as under:-

(i) Petitioner was working as Head Master in the Government Junior High School, Sadhunagar, Block Sitarganj, District Udham Singh Nagar. He retired from the said post on 01.08.2018 on attaining the age of superannuation. Petitioner was not granted extension of service by the respondent-department. The prayer of the petitioner for extension of service was rejected vide order dated 27.07.2018 passed by respondent no.4, District Education Officer, Elementary Education, Udham Singh Nagar.



Aggrieved by the said order, petitioner moved this Court by filing WPSS No. 3051 of 2018, Rajveer Singh vs. State of Uttarakhand & others. By virtue of an interim order dated 16.11.2018 passed in that writ petition, petitioner joined as Head Master of the said school on extension of service on 30.11.2018. The extension of the service of the petitioner came to an end on 30.03.2019.

(ii) The writ petition was later on dismissed as infructuous and petitioner was directed to move a representation before the authority concerned for arrears of salary from the date of his retirement till he joined by virtue of the interim order passed by this Court. The said representation was rejected by the impugned order dated 24.12.2025. The reasons assigned by respondent no.4 in the said order are that petitioner joined on 30.11.2018 by virtue of the interim order passed by this Court and he did not render service during August, September, October and November, 2018, therefore, petitioner cannot claim salary for that period. Accordingly, same was denied. Feeling aggrieved by the said order, petitioner is before this Court.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner put his signatures in the school attendance register right from the date of his retirement till he joined on extension of service, therefore, he is entitled to get salary for the aforesaid months of 2018.

4. Per contra, learned State Counsel submits that when there was no order of extension of service in favour of the petitioner prior to 30.11.2018, the effective date of joining on extension of service would be 30.11.2018,



2026:UHC:4857

therefore, there is no infirmity in the order impugned in the present writ petition.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record, and appreciated the facts involved in the present writ petition. This Court is of the opinion that there is no infirmity in the order impugned in the present writ petition, as the service of the petitioner was extended w.e.f. 30.11.2018 and, prior thereto, there was no order to reflect that the services of the petitioner had been extended. Therefore, this Court does not find any illegality in the order impugned.

6. Accordingly, no interference is warranted. The writ petition is dismissed in-*limine*.

7. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

16.06.2026

AK