

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL  
AT DEHRADUN**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. C-05 /SB/2025**

*(Arising out of judgment dated 29.11.2022,  
passed in Claim petition No. 90/SB/2022 & judgment  
dated 26.06.2024 passed in Execution Petition No.  
19/SB/2024)*

Laxmi Prasad Gairola, S/o Late Shri J.P.Gairola, presently working and posted on the post of Revenue Inspector, Tehsil, Jyotirmath, District Chamoli, Uttarakhand.

**.....Petitioner/applicant**

**vs.**

1. Sri Ramesh Kumar Sudhanshu, Principal Secretary (Revenue), Govt. of Uttarakhand, Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun..
2. Sri Vinay Shankar Pandey, Commissioner, Garhwal Mandal, Uttarakhand, Pauri Garhwal.
3. Sri Sandeep Tiwari, District Magistrate and Collector, District Chamoli.
4. Sri Girish Chandra Tiwari, Tehsildar, Tehsil Karanprayag, District Chamoli.

**.....Respondents**

Present: Sri L.K.Maithani, Advocate, for the petitioner-applicant.  
Sri V.P. Devrani, A.P.O. in assistance of the Tribunal.

**JUDGMENT**

**DATED: MARCH 20, 2025**

**Justice U.C.Dhyani (Oral)**

Present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner/applicant for initiating action under the Contempt of Court Act, against the respondents for not complying with the orders of the Tribunal

dated 29.11.2022 passed in Claim Petition No.. 90/DB/2022 and order dated 26.06.2024, passed in Execution Petition No. 19/SB/2024 .

2. Contempt Petition is supported with the affidavit of petitioner-applicant. Relevant documents have been filed along with the same.

3. It is the submission of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner-applicant that petitioner's prayer is for grant of ACP, for which he has moved representation, but his representation is not being decided because it appears that petitioner's service book is missing from the office of S.D.M. Karanprayag.

4. S.D.M. Chamoli *vide* letter dated 31.05.2023 requested the S.D.M. Karanprayag to send the service record of the petitioner, but there is no headway in the matter and the petitioner is being harassed unnecessarily.

5. Considering the facts noted above, it appears that the representation of the petitioner will not be decided in immediate future and the petitioner will be put to unnecessary harassment on this count alone.

6. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner-applicant submitted that liberty be granted to the petitioner to file fresh claim petition for grant of ACP. He also submitted that contempt petition will be filed, if and when so required, in near future.

7. Rule 50 of the Uttar Pradesh Public Services (Tribunal) Rules, 1992, reads as below:

**“50. Initiation of proceedings.—**(1) Any petition, information or motion for action being taken under the Contempt shall, in the first instance, be placed before the Chairman.

(2) The Chairman or the Vice-Chairman or such other Members as may be designated by him of this purpose, shall determine the expediency or propriety of taking action under the Contempt Act.”

*[Emphasis supplied]*

8. In the circumstances, as have been narrated above, the Tribunal does not feel it proper or expedient to take action against the alleged contemnors/ opposite parties under the Contempt of Court Act, as of now.

9. Contempt petition is disposed of, at the admission stage, with liberty to the petitioner to file fresh claim petition, arraying – (i) S.D.M. Karanprayag, (ii) S.D.M. Chamoli, (iii) D.M. Chamoli and (iv) Secretary, Revenue, State of Uttarakhand, as party respondents, for seeking the desired reliefs.

**(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)**  
CHAIRMAN

*DATE: MARCH 20, 2025.*  
*DEHRADUN*

VM