BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL
BENCH AT NAINITAL

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Dhyani
------ Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Arun Singh Rawat
-------Vice Chairman (A)

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. C-11/NB /DB/2025

(*Arising out of judgment dated 07.11.2024, passed in Claim petition No. 125/NB/DB/2023*)

Sri Suresh Chandra, aged about 42 years, s/o Late Sri Kailash Chandra Arya, presently posted in IRB 1st Ramnagar, District Nainital, and others.

……Petitioners

vs.

1. Smt. Neeru Garg, Inspector General of Police, PAC Head Quarter, Dehradun.
2. Sri Mukesh Kumar, Deputy Inspector General of Police, PAC Head Quarter, Dehradun.
3. Smt. Shahjahan Javed, w/o Naimuddin, Additional Superintendent of Police, Head Quarter, Dehradun.

…….Respondents

(*virtually*)
Present: Sri Subhash Joshi, Advocate, for the Petitioner. [Mob. No. 9458922108]
Sri Kishore Kumar, A.P.O. in assistance of the Tribunal.

JUDGMENT

DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2025.

Justice U.C. Dhyani (Oral)

Claim Petition No. 125/NB/DB/2023, Suresh Chandra and others vs. State of Uttarakhand and others was filed by the petitioners before the Public Services Tribunal at Nainital Bench. The same was disposed of *vide* order dated 07.11.2024. Operative portion, which has been quoted in Para 2 of the present contempt petition, reads as under:

> "In view of the above, the respondent authorities are directed to give time as prescribed under Rule 9(2) of the Uttaranchal Govt. Servants Seniority Rules, 2002 to the petitioners, to file their objections against the aforesaid tentative seniority list and the same be disposed of by a reasoned and speaking order, within 30 days ,till the seniority list is finalized on the basis of the objections, the final seniority list issued vide letter dated 16.11.2022 shall be kept in abeyance."

2. Petitioners/applicants have filed present contempt petition against the respondents/O.Ps. for awarding appropriate punishment to them, under the Contempt of Court Act, and direct the respondents to cancel the tentative seniority list dated 26.11.2025, so far as it relates to the applicants, who were promoted on the basis of written examination.

3. Sri Subhash Joshi, Ld. Counsel for the petitioners/applicants submitted that the order should not have been passed in the way it has been passed, to the detriment of the petitioners.

4. The Tribunal is of the view that the order dated 07.11.2024 has been complied with. It is a different matter that the seniority list which has been finalized, after considering the objections of the petitioners, is not in favour of the petitioners. But, in doing so, it cannot be said that the order of the Tribunal has been flouted.

5. Contempt petition will not lie, in the circumstances. The only course, which is open to the petitioners, is to file fresh claim petition, by challenging the impugned order, which has been passed in compliance of the order dated 07.11.2024 of the Tribunal.

6. Ld. Counsel for the petitioners seeks and is granted liberty to file fresh claim petition, challenging the impugned order dated 26.11.2025, in accordance with law.

7. Contempt petition thus stands disposed of.

(ARUN SINGH RAWAT)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)
CHAIRMAN

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2025
DEHRADUN

VM