

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 1221/2025

Mahendra Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Ratti Ram Sharma, Aged About 64 Years, Retired Senior Assistant, Government Senior Secondary School, Jagta-Basai, Tehsil Kishangarh-Bas, District Alwar, R/o D-82, Surya Nagar, Alwar 301 001

-----Petitioner

Versus

1.

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary To The Govt., Finance Department (Rules Division), Rajasthan, Jaipur, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur 302 005
2.

Shri Vaibhav Galariya, Principal Secretary To The Government Finance Department, Rajasthan Government Secretariat, Jaipur 302 005
3.

Dr. Dev Raj, The Director, Pension And Pensioner Welfare Department, Rajasthan, Vidyut Marg, Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur (Rajasthan) 302 005
4.

Shri Sita Ram Jat, The Director (Secondary Education) Bikaner, Rajasthan
5.

Smt. Shakuntala Meena, The Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan, Kishangarh-Bas (Khairthal-Tijara)
6.

Shri Mohan Kaushik, The Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Jagta Basai, Tehsil Kishangarh-Bas, (Khairthal-Tijara)

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Namita Singh, Adv. for Mr. Pradeep Singh, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Sharma, AAG with Mr. S. M. Sharma, Adv. & Mr. Manik Kaswan, Adv. Ms. Harshita Verma, Adv., Mr. Kuldeep Singh Rathore, AAAG for Ms. Mahi Yadav, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

16/03/2026

1. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents submits that in compliance of order dated 19.02.2025, the respondents have paid Rs.1,02,892/- as interest on delayed payment of pension as well as gratuity. It is submitted that earlier on account of bona fide error, the interest was also calculated on delayed payment of amount of privilege leave also, which is otherwise not admissible as per Rule 89 of Rajasthan Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1996 (for short 'the Rules of 1996').

2. However, his statement was opposed by learned counsel for the petitioner and she submitted that interest @ 9% is also admissible on delayed payment of amount of privilege leave, however, she utterly failed to point out any specific rule in this regard.

3. This Court perused the directions given in order dated 19.02.2025 and as the directions were to make payment of interest in accordance with Rule 89 of the Rules of 1996 and Rule 89 does not cover the benefits of privilege leave for the purpose of interest, therefore, under these circumstances, this Court finds that sufficient compliance has already been made by the respondents.

4. In view of above, there is no case of deliberate and willful disobedience, the contempt petition filed by the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

5. Notices stand discharged.

(ANAND SHARMA),J