HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 1146/2026
CNR: RJHC020639252026 | URN: CCP / 1199U / 2026

Devi Singh S/o Kunwar Singh, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Gurdha Dang, Tehsil Bayana, District Bharatpur, Worked As Assistant Teacher (Senior Siksha Karmi), Government Upper Primary School, Gurdha Dang, Block Bayana, District Bharatpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri Rajesh Kumar Yadav, Additional Chief Secretary, Elementary Education Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Shri Atul Chaturvedi, District Education Officer, Elementary Education, Headquarter Bharatpur.
3. Manorma Yadav, Chief Block Elementary Officer (Cbeo), Bayana, District Bharatpur.
4. Shri Karan Singh Meena, Panchayat Education Officer, Principal, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Shahpur Dang, Block Bayana, District Bharatpur.
5. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Satya Pal Poshwal
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. S.S. Naruka, AAG Ms. Ritika Naruka, AAAG Mr. Manish Sharma

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

27/10/2026

1. The present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 02.12.2025 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8966/2024.

2. Vide the order dated 02.12.2025, the Court has set aside the order dated 18.03.2024 whereby the services of the petitioner were terminated and the respondents were directed to reinstate contractual services of the petitioner on the post of Shiksha Sahayak. The Court also observed that the petitioner would be entitled only for national benefits for the period for which he has not discharged his duties and further he has also entitled for actual benefits from the date of resumption of duty under the relevant rules.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents submits that in compliance of directions, the petitioner has been reinstated back in service vide order dated 21.10.2026 and he is being paid remuneration in actual from the date of reinstatement.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents have taken much time in issuing the order for reinstatement. He further submits that the Court has passed the order on 02.12.2025 for reinstatement of the petitioner, however, the respondents have issued the order of reinstatement on 21.10.2026.

5. Heard and considered.

6. Though there was no specific time given in the order for issuing the order of reinstatement, however the respondents should have issued the order of reinstatement in a reasonable time. Taking ten months time in opinion of this Court it is not a reasonable time.

7. This Court finds that since the respondents have reinstated the petitioner to continue in service, the Court deems it just and

proper to issue warning to the respondents to be careful in future in making compliance of the Court's order without any delay.

8. In view of the fact that petitioner has already been reinstated, the present contempt petition is disposed of.

9. Contempt notices stand discharged.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

93/RASHMI