



2026:CGHC:20628

**NAFR**

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**CONT No. 625 of 2026**

Shivani Thudgar W/o. Anshul Thudgar Aged About 42 Years Working As Computer And Posted At Office Of Chief Medical And Health Officer, Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.)

**... Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

Dr. M.P. Maheshwar Divisional Joint Director Department Of Health Service, Old Nursing Hostel, D.K.S. Campus Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

**... Respondent(s)**

|                 |                                    |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : Mr. Vinod Kumar Sharma, Advocate |
| For Respondents | : None.                            |

**HON'BLE SHRI PARTH PRATEEM SAHU, JUDGE**

**ORDER ON BOARD**

**04.05.2026**

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 20.02.2026 stating that the petitioner though is promoted pursuant to the order passed in the writ petition, from the date when the juniors to the petitioner have been promoted and have also granted the seniority, however, the pay for the period from the date when juniors to the petitioner were promoted till the order of promotion passed in favour of the petitioner is not been granted.

2. The operative portion of the subject matter of the petition is extracted below for ready reference;

“9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and upon due appreciation of the submissions advanced as well as the material available on record, the writ petition deserves to be and is hereby allowed. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to grant promotion to the petitioner from the date on which she has claimed promotion, subject to due verification of her eligibility and other requisite service particulars. While undertaking such verification, the respondents shall ensure that the petitioner is extended the same treatment and benefit as accorded to her juniors, so as to maintain parity and avoid any discrimination.”

3. The petitioner has been granted promotion from the date when the other juniors or the similarly placed employees have been granted promotion is not disputed by the petitioner. So far as the second portion which learned counsel had pressed upon talks about while undertaking such verification, the parity is to be maintained to avoid discrimination, it does not mention about any other benefits to be extended to the petitioner. It is not the case of the petitioner that at the time of verification of the eligibility and other requisite service particulars the petitioner has been discriminated.
4. In the aforementioned facts of the case, I do not find any good ground to admit this petition and initiate the contempt proceedings. Accordingly, the contempt petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

**(Parth Prateem Sahu)**  
JUDGE