IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADSH
AT SHIMLA

COPC No.1858 of 2026
Decided on: 06.11.2026

Pritam Chand ....Petitioners

Versus

Ritesh Chauhan and others

....Respondents

Coram :
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge
[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner: Mr.Bhim Raj Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Sumit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge.

Petitioner has invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court alleging non compliance of the order dated 23.09.2026 [Annexure C-1] passed in CWP No. 15266 of 2026 titled as Pritam Chand versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others, wherein, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court had passed the following orders:-

> Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner has submitted that since the petitioner was retired on attaining the age of 58 years on 30.06.2026, and as he

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

has a right to continue in service till the age of 60 years, it be ordered in the interregnum that he be reinstated against the post on which he was serving as on 30.06.2026 and be allowed to work till he attains the age of 60 years.

Having heard learned counsel for the applicant/ petitioner and in light of the fact that no reply to the stay application has been filed despite opportunity granted, in the interregnum, we order that the petitioner will be reengaged against the same post and at the same place where the petitioner was serving at the time of retirement on 30.06.2026, subject to any further orders that may be passed by this Court.

However, this order will be subject to the petitioner refunding the retiral benefits, if any, received by the petitioner from the department.

In case the retiral benefits, if any, received by the petitioner are deposited back by him with the employer within two weeks from today, then the respondents shall forthwith re-engage him in terms of this order.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of the orders dated 23.09.2026 [Annexure C-1], though petitioner had submitted a representation to Deputy

Director, Animal Health and Breeding, Chamba, requesting to reengage him in service, as he was ready and willing to deposit the retiral benefits received by him but despite this the respondents were not implementing the orders passed by this Court.

3. Heard.

4. Notice. Mr. Sumit Sharma, Learned Deputy Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. Upon listing the matter, Learned State Counsel has furnished instructions dated 06.11.2026 and communication dated 02.11.2026 [Taken on Record], as received from Director, Animal Husbandry, Himachal Pradesh directing the Deputy Director, Animal Health/ Breeding, Chamba to comply with the orders subject to fulfillment of the conditions regarding refund of retiral benefits.

6. Faced with above situation, Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of communication dated 02.11.2026, since the respondents have undertaken to implement the orders passed by this Court, subject to refund of retiral benefits by the petitioner, therefore, instant

proceedings can be closed by passing appropriate directions for compliance. [Statement taken on record].

7. Considering the matter in aforesaid terms instant petition is disposed of, as agreed by Learned State Counsel, with the direction, that in case, the petitioner turns up for depositing the retiral benefits any day before November 20, 2026, in that event, Respondents-State Authorities shall immediately re-engage the petitioner, so as to ensure implementation of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench as referred to above.

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

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

November 6, 2026
(tm)