



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Civil Contempt No. 509 of 2020

06 April, 2026

Naresh Das --Petitioner
Versus
Ranjeet Sinha & anr. --Respondents

With

Civil Contempt No. 482 of 2020

Shubham Ramola --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

With

Civil Contempt No. 440 of 2020

Yogesh Bhatt --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

With

Civil Contempt No. 441 of 2020

Bipin Jayara --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

With

Civil Contempt No. 442 of 2020

Ramesh Chandra Sharma --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

With

Civil Contempt No. 443 of 2020

Vinod Chandra Joshi & Anr. --Petitioners
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 444 of 2020

Sunil Aswal --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 462 of 2020

Geeta Nagarkoti --Petitioner
Versus
C Ravi Shankar & Anr. --Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 463 of 2020



2026:UHC:2413

Mohan Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 464 of 2020

Pankaj Singh Kholia

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 465 of 2020

Madhu Negi

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 533 of 2020

Harish Chandra Pandey

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 534 of 2020

Amit Kothiyal

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 536 of 2020

Balesh Kumar Katarya

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 537 of 2020

Kusum Verma Shah

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 538 of 2020

Mamta Kanyal

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 539 of 2020

Rajesh Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 540 of 2020

Deepak Rawat

--Petitioner

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Civil Contempt No. 542 of 2020



2026:UHC:2413

--Petitioner

Vinod Singh

Versus

C Ravi Shankar & Anr.

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. M C Pant, learned counsel for the applicant.

Mr. Ganesh Kanpal, learned Addl. Advocate General for the State.

(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)

1. All these contempt petitions have been moved for initiating the proceeding under the Contempt of Court's Act for non compliance of the judgment and order passed by the Coordinate Bench dated 10.10.2018 in bunch of the writ petitions the leading one is WPSS No. 2271 of 2018, Pankaj Negi vs. State of Uttarakhand and others.

2. As it appears from the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge dated 10.10.2018 bunch of petitions were decided in terms of the judgment dated 11.12.2012 passed by the Division Bench in Special Appeal No. 258 of 2012. Judgment dated 11.12.2012, passed by the Division Bench in Special Appeal No. 258 of 2012 is also enclosed and the operative portion of the said judgment is being reproduced herein as under:-

"2. The State Government has filed an affidavit, where it has stated that the said letter dated 30th December, 2008 applies only to those Industrial Training Institutes and Industrial Training Centres, which are seeking new affiliation. We do not accept the said contention. The mandate contained in the said letter is required to be reflected in the affiliation proforma and, at the same time, the Standing Committee inspecting the Institutes is also to ensure that the salaries of the instructors, appointed on contract, are at par with regular faculty. Therefore, while applying for affiliation, the condition contained in the letter dated 30th December, 2008 has to be complied with and affiliated Industrial Training Institutes or Industrial Training Centres are also required to comply with the directions contained in the said letter, inasmuch as, the Standing Committee inspecting the Institutes, which have already got affiliation, has been directed to ensure that the salaries of instructors appointed on contract



basis, are at par with regular faculty. The State Government, in its counter affidavit, has stated that the said direction dated 30th December, 2008 is not binding on it, inasmuch as, it does not get any financial assistance from the Central Government pertaining to remuneration payable to faculty members of Industrial Training Institutes and Industrial Training Centres. The fact remains that the Industrial Training Institutes and Industrial Training Centres are functioning because they are affiliated with the Director General of Employment & Training. If the State Government is to keep and maintain such affiliation, it is bound to accept the directions contained in the said letter dated 30th December, 2008, whether it receives any grant or financial assistance from the Central Government or not.

3. We, accordingly, hold that the State Government, in the matter of payment of remuneration to the appellant, a contract faculty, is bound to honour the directions contained in the said letter dated 30th December, 2008 of the Director General of Employment & Training.

4. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. The judgment and order under appeal is set aside and the writ petition is disposed of by directing the State Government to pay the difference of the remuneration to the appellant within three months from today and to continue to pay remuneration to him in accordance with the directions contained in the said letter dated 30th December, 2008, until such time, appellant continues to discharge duties as a contract faculty.”

3. Another Special Appeal No. 154 of 2019 was also filed by the State and the same was also dismissed on the ground that the order under Appeal is a consent order and an intra-court appeal, in terms of Chapter VIII Rule 5 of the Allahabad High Court Rules, would not lie and dismissed the appeal on 11.03.2019. While dismissing the aforesaid appeal, the liberty was sought to seek review of the judgment and the liberty was granted to file review against the order under appeal.

4. Thereafter various review applications were moved, however, all the review applications were also dismissed on 30.03.2020. Thereafter contempt petitions have been moved.



5. In the contempt petition response affidavit has been filed by respondent no. 1 Secretary, Skill Development and Employment and simultaneously response affidavit has also been filed by respondent no. 2.

6. Mr. M.C. Pant, learned counsel for the petitioner also contended that against the order rejecting review application, the respondents went in an appeal before the Hon'ble Apex Court but the same was also dismissed.

7. Today, Mr. Ganesh Kanpal, learned Addl. Advocate General, on instructions, informed to this Court that special fund has been allotted in order to comply the judgment passed by the Division Bench dated 11.12.2012 and the necessary budget will be released by the end of this month and thereafter disbursement will be made to the petitioners as per law.

8. Mr. M.C. Pant, learned counsel submits that if such a statement has been given then there is no useful purpose to continue the proceedings of all these contempt petitions.

9. In such view of the matter, particularly in view of the statement as given by Mr. Ganesh Kandpal, learned Addl. Advocate General that fund has been allotted and the budget will be released by the end of this month, there is no useful purpose to continue the proceeding of all these contempt petitions, since, the judgment in fact has been substantially complied with.

10. In such view of the matter the proceeding of all the contempt petitions are closed. It is made clear that if there is no further compliance the petitioners are free to approach this Court.

(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)

Parul



2026:UHC:2413