

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. C-01 /DB/2026**

*(Arising out of judgment dated 13.06.2023,  
passed in Claim petition No. 19/DB/2023 &  
judgment dated 04.06.2024 passed in Execution  
Petition No. 17/SB/2024)*

Dr. Abha Singh aged about 41 years, d/o Sri Jai Prakash Singh ,r/o S-1/4-25 A, Raj Rajeshwari Nagar, Gilat Bazar, Varansi, Uttar Pradesh.

.....Petitioner/applicant

**vs.**

1. Sh. Deependra Kumar Chaudhary, Secretary, Ayush and Ayush Education Secretariat, Dehradun District Dehradun.
2. Sh. Vijay Kumar Jogdande, Additional Secretary Ayush and Ayush Education Secretariat Dehradun, District Dehradun.
3. Sh. Vijay Kumar Jogdande, Director Ayurvedic and Unani Services Danda Lakhond Post Office Gujrara, Near I.T. Park, Sahastradhara Road, Dehfadun, District Dehradun.
4. Dr. Shravan Kumar Tripathi District Ayurvedic and Unani Officer District Chamoli.

.....Respondents/ O.Ps.

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

**JUDGMENT**

**DATED: FEBRUARY 03, 2026**

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

Claim Petition No. 19/DB/2023 Dr. Abha Singh vs. State of Uttarakhand and others was decided by the Tribunal *vide* order dated 13.06.2023. Operative portion of the decision reads as under:

“ 18. The petition is disposed of by directing respondent no. 1, Secretary, Ayush and Ayush Education, Govt. of Uttarakhand, to reconsider his decision dated 29.03.2019, in the peculiar facts of the case, primarily on two counts (i) she was physically present in the office of D.A.U.O. on 14.08.2015 and (ii) Dr. Vijay Kumar Gangwar and Dr. Savita Sonkar, both medical officers, were given joining in Pithoragarh in the similar circumstances on 03.11.2015, whereas the petitioner was given joining only on 03.08.2016 in Chamoli. Informed decision may be taken by respondent no. 1 within 10 weeks from the date of presentation of certified copy of this order. No order as to costs.”

2. When the order was not complied with, Execution Petition was filed by the petitioner/applicant, on which the Tribunal served a reminder to the respondent authorities to reconsider their decision dated 29.03.2019, in the peculiar facts of the case. The reasons for reconsidering their decision were given in the judgment dated 13.06.2023 itself. The execution petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 04.06.2024, at the admission stage.
3. When the order of the Tribunal was not complied with, petitioner was compelled to file contempt petition.
4. On the contempt petition, Ld. A.P.O., who is assisting the Tribunal, was requested to seek instructions from the respondent department. Today Dr. Deshraj Singh, Senior Medical Officer and Dr. Lalit Tiwari, Medical Officer appeared before the Tribunal and placed the Office Memorandum dated 02.02.2026, passed by the Secretary, Ayush and Ayush Education, in the Government. Ld. A.P.O. submitted that the order of the Tribunal has been complied with.
5. Sri L.K.Maithani, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner/applicant vehemently opposed the compliance, submitting that the observations made by the Tribunal in its decisions dated 13.06.2023 and 04.06.2024 have not been taken into account by the respondent department while reconsidering the prayer of the petitioner and rejecting her claim.
6. The order passed by Respondent No.1 *vide* order dated 02.02.2026, while reconsidering the case of the petitioner, might be wrong in the estimation of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner/applicant, but the fact remains that the case of the petitioner has been reconsidered, although petitioner’s claim has been rejected.

7. The only course in the humble opinion of the Tribunal, left to the petitioner is to file fresh claim petition for redressal of her grievance.

8 Rule 50 of the Uttar Pradesh Public Services (Tribunal) Rules, 1992, reads as under:

**“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]*

The Tribunal finds that it will not be expedient or proper to initiate action against the respondents under the Contempt Act.

9. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the contempt petition pending. The same is, accordingly closed, leaving it open to the petitioner to file fresh claim petition, as per law, for redressal of her grievances.

**(ARUN SINGH RAWAT)**  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

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

VM

*DATE: FEBRUARY 03, 2026  
DEHRADUN*

VM