

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 1664/2017
In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17286/2015

Bharti Singh Tanwar W/o Shri Manjeet Singh Tanwar D/o Shri Laxmikant Verma, aged about 30 years, R/o Plot No. 97-A, Patel Nagar Niwaru Road, Jhotwara, Jaipur Presently Posted As Teacher Grade III, In Govt. Primary Upper Primary School Idan Ka Bas, Kalwar, Panchayat Samiti Dudu, Distt. Jaipur Raj. At Presently On Deputation At Govt. Upper Primary School Aada Gala, Chomu, Jaipur

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Mr. Naveen Mahajan, Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Raj., Secretariat, Jaipur Raj.
2. Mr. Alok Ranjan, The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parisad Jaipur
3. Mr. Ratan Singh Yadav, The Distt. Education Officer, (Elementary Education) Jaipur
4. Mrs. Rajeshwari, The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Dudu, Distt. Jaipur
5. Mr. Ramesh Chand Verma, The Block Elementary Education Officer, Panchayat Samiti Dudu, Distt. Jaipur
6. State Of Rajasthan Through Its Principal Secretary Of Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Dr. Shivendra S. Rathore
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. S.S. Naruka, AAG with Ms. Ritika Naruka

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA
Order

01/05/2026

1. Learned counsel for the respondents, at the outset submitted that the due amount as admissible as per judgment dated 23.05.2017 has already been paid to the petitioner therefore, no compliance is left to be made.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner on the contrary submitted that although, principal amount has been paid yet, the interest has not been paid to the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that in order dated 23.05.2017, it was specified that in case, arrears shall be paid to the petitioner within a period of three months failing which, the petitioner shall be at liberty to claim interest on the delayed payment.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

4. It has not been disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner that the principal amount has already been paid to the petitioner as directed vide order dated 23.05.2017, thus he does not dispute that substantial compliance has already been made however, his only objection is that the compliance has been made within eight and half years, for which, he is entitled to claim interest.

5. In view of above, where the rate of interest has not been specified in order dated 23.05.2017, no deliberate non-compliance can be said to be on the part of the respondents, however, petitioner shall be at liberty to raise the issue by way of filing a separate substantive petition.

6. In the light of above, this contempt petition is hereby, dismissed.

7. Notices stand discharged.

8. Petitioner shall be at liberty to file his separate petition for the purpose of claiming interest, if any.

(ANAND SHARMA),J