

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No. 1216 of 2026

Date of decision: 16.09.2026.

Anju Bala ...Petitioner.

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar & another ...Respondents.

Coram:

The Hon’ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner : Mr. Tarun K. Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Varun Chandel, Additional
Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge:

Petitioner, has invoked the contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the judgment dated 11.05.2026 [Annexure C-1], passed by this Court in CWP No. 15772 of 2025, titled as Anju Bala vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & another, directing the Respondents/Competent Authority to consider the case of petitioner afresh, by taking into account the provisions of the Act and the judgment relied upon; and by passing

¹ ***Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes***

a speaking order, after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner on or before 30.06.2026. It is averred that the petitioner submitted a representation dated 14.05.2026 [Annexure C-2] to Director School Education, Himachal Pradesh, requesting to implement the judgment, but in vain.

2. Notice in instant proceedings was issued by this Court on 13.08.2026, directing the Respondents to file the Compliance Affidavit/response.

3. Upon listing of the case today, Learned State Counsel has placed on record, a copy of Instructions dated 15.09.2026 [*Taken on record*], as imparted to him by Director School Education, Himachal Pradesh alongwith a copy of the office order dated 24.07.2026, whereby, the case of petitioner(s) has been rejected, with the findings that deemed regularization from the date of initial appointment/joining on contract basis cannot be granted and the consequential service benefits like seniority, annual increments, promotion or consequential benefits are not admissible, as the case of petitioner is distinguishable from the case of Nitin Kumar.

4. Since this Court had directed the Respondents/ Competent Authority to consider the grievance and pass a speaking order in accordance with law, which has now been passed by Respondents, as referred above, therefore, in these circumstances, instant proceedings are closed.

5. Upon closure of proceedings, liberty is granted to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy, by laying a challenge to speaking order/rejection order, hereinafter, in accordance with law.

6. In aforesaid circumstances, instant proceedings are closed and notice of contempt is discharged.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

16th September, 2026.
(kck)