IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

COPC No.1695 of 2026

IN

CWP No.995 of 2024

Decided on: 26.10.2026

Meenakshi .....Petitioner

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar and another ....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner: Mr. Vikas Rajput, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Gautam Sood, Deputy Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner has invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order dated 29.02.2024 *[Annexure P-1],* passed by this Court, in ***CWP No.995 of 2024,*** titled as *Meena Kumari and others versus State of H.P. and others.* The Operative part of the order reads as under:-

> "11. In these circumstances, and on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions of the petitioner, this Court permits the petitioner to make a fresh representation to the Respondent No.2-Director, Elementary

[1] *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

Education, Himachal Pradesh, within two weeks from today; with further directions to the aforesaid respondent to verify the facts and, in case, the petitioners are found to be similarly placed; then, to extend the similar benefit of deemed regular appointment as Trained Graduate Teachers (Arts/NM) to the petitioners, in the applicable regular pay scale of TGTs, from the date they were initially appointed on contract basis, by passing appropriate orders within six weeks thereafter.

12. Needless to say, that upon consideration, as aforesaid, in case, the petitioners are found to be similarly placed then, the eligible and admissible monetary benefits, in accordance with law, shall accrue to the petitioners."

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to judgment dated 29.02.2024 *[Annexure P-1],* though the benefit of deemed regular appointment from the date of initial contract appointment has been accorded from the date she was initially appointed on contract basis as per Office Order dated 18.06.2024 *[Annexure P-2]* but the admissible consequential benefits in terms of the judgment, in question, have been not be released as yet.

3. Heard.

4. Notice. Mr. Gautam Sood, Learned Deputy

Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. *At this stage,* Learned Counsel for the petitioner prays that Respondents may be directed to implement the order/judgment dated 29.02.2024 *[Annexure P-1]* in a time bound manner. Prayer being innocuous, is not opposed by Learned State Counsel also.

6. Considering the matter in above perspective and as prayed by Learned Counsel for the petitioner, instant petition is closed, with a direction to the Respondents to release admissible consequential benefits to the petitioner in terms of the judgment, in question, within six weeks from today.

7. Notices issued to the respondents shall stand discharged, accordingly.

8. Needless to say that in case the order/ judgment passed by this Court, is not complied with, the petitioner is free to seek appropriate remedy, in accordance with law.

In aforesaid terms, instant petition and all the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall

stand disposed of.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

October 26, 2026
[Bhardwaj]