



203

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

COCP-4345-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 02.02.2026

Parmod Kumar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

PC Meena, IAS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Sunil K. Nehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Jindal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Puneet Bhushan, Advocate for the respondent.

Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pratiksha Sharma, Advocate
for the applicant-proposed respondent No.2.
(in CM Nos.20496-97-CII-2024).

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. This is a contempt petition which has been filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 alleging the contempt of the order dated 09.08.2018 (Annexure P-1) passed by the LPA Bench in LPA No.1515 of 2015 and other connected cases.

2. The challenge in the present petition is to the final seniority list which has been drawn up. Though admittedly the petitioner was not a party to the writ petitions, however, he states that this is a general order and, hence, the present contempt petition would be maintainable at his behest. The grievance of the petitioner is that while drawing up the seniority list, he has been placed at Sr. No.114 whereas the proposed respondent - Radhey Sham -

has been placed at Sr. No.106. The only ground of challenge is that the date of joining of Radhey Sham was 16.09.2011 and that of the petitioner was 10.09.2011.

3. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant-proposed respondent No.2 has pointed out that the seniority list was to be prepared on the basis of the qualifications and five years' experience thereafter. It is further the contention that amongst a batch of entrants, the *inter se* seniority was to be kept intact and since the proposed respondent - Radhey Sham - was at Sr. No.2 in the selection list and the petitioner herein was at Sr. No.54, therefore, the seniority list has rightly been drawn up.

4. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent - DHBVN - would contend that there was a draft seniority list which was drawn up and the objections were called to the said seniority list. The petitioner herein did not file any objections, nor has he laid any challenge to the seniority list which has been drawn up. It is further the contention that there is no contempt made out and if at all the petitioner is aggrieved, he would need to challenge the seniority list.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner herein was placed higher than the proposed respondent - Radhey Sham - in the draft seniority list and objections of Radhey Sham were accepted and thereafter he was placed at Sr. No.106 and the petitioner was placed at Sr. No.114.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. In the present case the petitioner, admittedly, has not laid any challenge, till date, to the seniority list as has been drawn up. From a perusal of the petition as well as the facts, there is no contempt made out. The

petitioner could have challenged the seniority list which has been drawn up by the respondent, however, till date admittedly he has not laid any challenge.

8. In view thereof, this Court does not find any ground to entertain the present contempt petition and accordingly the same is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

9. Needless to say that in case the petitioner is so aggrieved, he would always be at liberty to avail his remedies as available in law.

02.02.2026
Yogesh Sharma

(**ALKA SARIN**)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO