




**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN  
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 483/2025

In

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1519/2025

Namo Narayan Vaidh S/o Shri Vrij Mohan Vaidh, Aged About 36  
Years, R/o Village Shyampura, Tehsil Bansur, District Alwar (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Smt. Gayatri A. Rathore, Principal Secretary, Medical And Health And Family Welfare Department Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dr. Ravi Prakash Sharma, Director (Public Health Services,) Tilak Marg, Jaipur.
3. Dr. Ravi Shekhawat, Chief Medical Health Officer, Jaipur-I,
4. Dr. Ashish Singh Shekhawat, Chief Medical And Health Officer, Kotputli (Behror)
5. Dr. Anil Kumar Yadav, Sr. Medical Officer Incharge, Govt. Community Health Center, Narehda, District Kotputli-Behror (Raj.)
6. State Of Rajasthan Principal Secretary, Medical And Health And Family Welfare Department Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Devendra Kumar Bhardwaj, Adv.  
For Respondent(s) : Ms. Tanvisha Pant, Adv. for  
Mr. Vigyan Shah, AAG

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEER BHATNAGAR**

**Order**

**Reportable**

**18/02/2026**

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, according to the order dated 30.01.2025 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition



No.1519/2025, the Court had directed the respondents to permit the petitioner to resume his duties. However, the respondents failed to comply with this order.

2. The contempt petition states that, through a representation dated 03.02.2025, the petitioner requested permission to join at CHC Narehda (Kotputli), and he also submitted another representation on 04.02.2025 to respondent No.5 seeking permission to join at that location. The petitioner subsequently filed various representations, but the respondents did not honour the Court's order dated 30.01.2025. As a result, it is urged that respondents Nos 1 to 5 should be taken to task under the Contempt of Courts Act.

3. The respondents' counsel countered, submitting that, following the impugned order of 30.01.2025, an additional affidavit along with Annexure-AA/1 was filed, detailing the actions taken by the respondents. Annexure-AA/1, an office order dated 03.02.2025, clearly directed the petitioner to report for duty at the Government Hospital Legislative Assembly. Nevertheless, the petitioner did not join as instructed. Subsequently, a show-cause notice was issued to him, requiring an explanation. Later, Annexure-AA/3 indicated that the post of DDC Helper in the Legislative Assembly had been abolished. On 15.12.2025, the petitioner was again directed by order to join as DDC Helper at Kotputli, with sanction already granted as per Annexure-AA/4, dated 10.12.2025.

4. It is further contended that no contempt had been committed, as the petitioner was merely insisting on being stationed at a specific place, which is evident from the petition





itself. The petitioner's actions are an abuse of the legal process, having dragged the respondents to court without any willful disobedience; hence, the petition should be dismissed.

5. After hearing the arguments and reviewing the record, this Court recalled that the order dated 30.01.2025 in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1519/2025 directed the respondents to allow the petitioner to resume duties. The order did not specify that he should join at a particular location.

6. The petitioner's contention in the contempt petition claims that, after providing the Court's order and his representations requesting to join at CHC Narehda (Kotputli), he was denied. He also submitted multiple requests for placement at that station, yet the respondents refused to permit it.

7. The Court's order was unambiguous, and it did not specify any location.

8. The respondents' record, comprising Annexures-AA/1 to AA/3, demonstrates that the petitioner was directed to join the DDC Helper post at the Legislative Assembly, but he failed to do so despite repeated notices. Furthermore, records including the order from the placement agency dated 15.12.2025, initiated by CMHO Jaipur, show that the petitioner was instructed to join at Kotputli-Behror. This clearly indicates that, despite explicit instructions, he refused to take up the DDC Helper role at the Legislative Assembly and repeatedly sought to be posted only to CHC Kotputli, a posting no order ever mandated.

9. The petition itself reveals that the petitioner was determined to push for a posting at CHC Kotputli. His actions, making several attempts to pressure officials into placing him at his preferred





location, show a clear pattern. Even after the office order directing him to join the DDC Helper position at the Legislative Assembly, he continued to try to influence the process. This conduct amounts to an attempt to pressure the respondents, and the filing of the contempt petition constitutes an abuse of the legal process. Consequently, the petition is dismissed, with a costs order of Rs. 5,000/- in favour of the respondent.

10. The petitioner is directed to deposit the cost of Rs. 5,000/- in the Office of the Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority, Jaipur, within three months. Failure to do so will empower the Authority to recover the amount in accordance with the law.

11. In conclusion, the contempt petition is dismissed, and the rule is discharged.

12. A copy of this order be sent to Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority, Jaipur for necessary compliance.

**(PRAVEER BHATNAGAR),J**

Ashwani Kr Srivastava /-27

