

4. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. Respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner for counting the period he has worked on contract basis with effect from 1995 till regularization with all the consequential benefits in view of the principles laid down in the judgment cited hereinabove. Needful be done within a period of ten weeks after the receipt of certified copy of this judgment by the petitioner. No costs."

It is this order which is at the root of the present controversy.

The submission advanced on behalf of the petitioner is that despite clear direction issued by the High Court, the case of the petitioner has not been considered and no benefit in respect of the services rendered on contract basis has been afforded to the petitioner for the purposes of seniority.

Our attention has also been invited to the consequential order passed by the Department on 06.04.2018. The text of the order shows that certain reasons had weighed with the authority while rejecting the representation made by the petitioner.

Whether such rejection would give cause of action to maintain a petition invoking jurisdiction in contempt or an execution petition, is the issue.

The orders passed by the High Court have rejected the submissions made by the petitioner and dismissed the applications for initiation of contempt and execution.

In our view, the text of the consequential order, at best, may afford a further cause of action for the petitioner to maintain appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

In the circumstances, we see nothing wrong in the view taken by the High Court in the instant matters.

These Special Leave Petitions are, therefore, dismissed with the aforesaid observations.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MUKESH NASA)
COURT MASTER

(PRADEEP KUMAR)
BRANCH OFFICER