RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 609/2017
CNR: RJHC020111592017 | URN: CCP / 630U / 2017

Mrs. Shashi Singh W/o Late Shir Brijendra Singh

----Petitioner

Versus

Shri Kuldeep Ranka and Ors.

----Respondents

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ashwini Jaiman with Mr. Moin Khan and Mr. Keshav Parashar
For Respondent(s)	:	Ms. Mahi Yadav, AAG with Mr. Kuldeep Singh Rathore and Ms. Chelsi Agarwal Mr. Vasudev Malawat, Director, ICDS, (Respondent No.5) Ms. Alka Bishnoi, OIC for respondent No.3

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

06/10/2026

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 08.12.2016 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.3299/2002.

2. Vide order dated 08.12.2016, the Court allowed the writ petition and set aside the order dated 30.03.2002, whereby the petitioner was reverted from the post of Project Director to Child Development Project Officer (for short 'CDPO') and further in view of the fact that the petitioner has attained the age of superannuation, the Court directed the respondents to give consequential benefits within a period of three months from the date of passing of the order.

(Uploaded on 08/10/2026 at 11:55:18 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:28 PM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that no any benefit, accruing to the petitioner on setting aside the order of demotion dated 30.03.2002, has been paid/given to the petitioner, meaning thereby, the petitioner has not been allowed the benefits of pay difference and so also the retiral benefits and pension.

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

4. Ms. Mahi Yadav, learned Additional Advocate General, on instruction from the respondent No.5, who is personally present before this Court, submits that part compliance of the order of the Court has been made as the Women and Child Development Department has issued necessary orders and forwarded the case of the petitioner to the Pension Department for grant of pension.

5. The respondent No.5, who is personally present before this Court on a query made by the Court, states that full compliance of the Court's order has not been made as due benefits ordered by the Court has not been actually given to the petitioner.

6. It is very surprising that the respondents have not complied with the order of the Court even after passing of more than ten years though, there was specific direction of the Court to comply the order within a period of three months.

7. From the facts on record, it is borne out that the order, which is the subject matter of this contempt petition i.e. order dated 08.12.2016, was subjected to challenge before the Higher Forum and in view of an SLP pending before the Hon'ble Apex Court, this contempt petition was earlier disposed of vide order dated 08.02.2018, however, on an application, the Court vide

(Uploaded on 08/10/2026 at 11:55:18 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:28 PM)

order dated 03.11.2025 restored the contempt petition to its original number and that too was in presence of the learned Additional Advocate General, representing the State Authorities. Even after passing of about ten months after restoration of contempt petition, the respondents have failed to comply with the direction of the Court. The respondents have come with certain orders so as to make compliance of the Court's order but, that is not sufficient in opinion of this Court. The respondents are all always under obligation to comply with the directions of the Court within the time given for the same and if they feel that they require some more time then they should have moved an appropriate application for extension of time. In the present case, no any application has been filed by the respondents for extension of time for making compliance of the Court's order. The order which is subject matter of this contempt petition was not stayed by any Court.

8. Taking into consideration the aforesaid and the overall facts, so also the fact that the respondents have failed to comply with the direction of the Court and have not extended the due benefits to the petitioner, in actual, so far, and are making prayer for allowing further two weeks' time for making compliance of the Court's order, this Court deems just and proper to impose an exemplary cost of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lacs Only) on the respondents for delay in making compliance of the Court's order. There is no sufficient reason shown by the respondent for such inordinate delay.

9. The respondents are directed to remain personally present before this Court on the next date of hearing i.e. on

(Uploaded on 08/10/2026 at 11:55:18 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:28 PM)

28.10.2026 and by that date, if the order of the Court is not complied with *in toto* then it will be treated deliberate disobedience on the part of the respondents and necessary orders will be passed on the next date of hearing.

10. The amount of cost, imposed as above, shall be recovered from the Officer, who remained posted on the post of Director, Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) since 09.03.2017 jointly. The cost amount shall be paid to the petitioner before next date of hearing in a form of a Demand Draft by the Women and Child Development Department at this stage, which may then be recovered by the Department from the Officer, as ordered above.

11. List this matter again on 28.10.2026

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

58/ARTI SHARMA

(Uploaded on 08/10/2026 at 11:55:18 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:28 PM)