HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 146/2021
CNR: RJHC020133092021 | URN: CCP / 158U / 2021

Sunita W/o Shri Radhey Shyam, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of B-58, Dayanand Puri, Kachchi Harijan Basti, Near Shamshan Ghat, Adarsh Nagar, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

----Petitioner

Versus

1 Gaytri Rathore, Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

2 Shri Om Prakash Bunkar, Director, Samaj Kalyan Vibhag, Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

3 Kiran Panwar, Superintendent , Mentally Retired Mahila Avem, Bal Kalyan Pratisthapan Grih, Samaj Kalyan Vibhag, Gandhi Nagar, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

4 State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Bharat Yadav
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Sharma, AAG assisted by Mr. Vishal Kumar

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA
Order

29/10/2026

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 22.07.2019 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4217/2004, whereby the Court directed the respondents to grant minimum regular pay scale to the petitioner from the date of initial appointment notionally and actual payment from the date of filing of the petition.

2. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents submits that the order in the writ petition was put to challenge before the Hon’ble Division Bench by filing D.B. Special

Appeal Writ No. 379/2026 and the Hon'ble Division Bench vide order dated 24.04.2026 ordered as under:

> *"7. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this appeal with liberty to the appellant to make payment in the minimum of the regular pay-scale till she worked with the Department under their orders."*

3. Learned Additional Advocate General further submits that the petitioner worked with the respondents from 22.09.2002 up to the month of March, 2004 and the due payments as directed by the Hon'ble Division Bench that is minimum of pay scale for the period which she worked, has been paid to the petitioner by sending a Demand Draft of Rs. 7,33,905/-, however the petitioner has refused to accept the Demand Draft thrice.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner on submitting aforesaid Demand Draft by the learned Additional Advocate General accepts the same subject to the verification of the computation of the amount.

4. In view of the above, in opinion of this Court the respondents have complied with the order which is the subject matter of this contempt petition.

5. Hence this contempt petition is disposed of.

6. However, petitioner would be at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy available to her under law, if there remains any other grievance of the petitioner.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

82/RAVINDRA