

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

Case:- CCP(S) No. 58/2024 in
WP(C) No. 1035/2023

1. Jamsheed Bibi, Age 70 years,
W/o Sh. Eid Mohd. D/o Barkat Bibi,
R/o Village Pouni, Tehsil and District
Reasi A/p Narwal Pain, Satwari,
Jammu, J&K.

2. Khursheed Bibi, Age 68 years
W/o Mishar Din, D/o Barkat Bibi,
R/o Village Pouni, Tehsil and District
Reasi
A/p Narwal Pain, Satwari, Jammu,
J&K.

.....Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate.

Vs

1. Mr. Prasanna Ramaswamy G, (IAS)
Commissioner Secretary to
Government Revenue Department,
Civil Secretariat, Jammu/Srinagar.
2. Shri Ramesh Kumar (IAS)
Divisional Commissioner, Jammu.
3. Mr. Vishesh Paul Mahajan, (JKAS),
Deputy Commissioner, Reasi.
4. Ms. Mohita Sharma, (IPS),
Sr. Superintendent of Police, Reasi.
5. Sh. Sahil Randhawa, Tehsildar,
Pouni (Reasi).

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG.

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAHUL BHARTI, JUDGE

ORDER
(02.07.2025)

1. The petitioners self invited the frustration of their writ cause by seeking disposal of the writ petition WP(C) No. 1035/2023 although with the consensus of the learned counsel for the official respondents in considering the writ petition as representation and its disposal.

2. However, the petitioners' counsel did not seek from the writ court as to which respondent out of five respondents was to be mandated to consider the writ petition of the petitioners as a representation and that seems to have resulted in nobody from the array of five respondents taking responsibility of dealing with the writ petition as a representation of the petitioners and this contempt petition has taken more than one year of court time lasting its pendency.

3. In the contempt petition, the petitioners have themselves made all the five incumbents serving as writ respondents, as contemnors in the contempt petition without clarifying in the contempt petition as to who out of the five named officials was supposed to consider the writ petition as a representation.

4. A compliance report has been submitted on behalf of the Tehsildar Pouni wherein it has been stated that the petitioners never came to the office of the Tehsildar Pouni regarding the subject matter of the writ petition otherwise also the Tehsildar Pouni in his compliance report sets out the state of facts and circumstances which bear reference to report dated 04.05.2024 of the Tehsildar Pouni on the state of facts and circumstances related to the alleged grievance of the petitioners and, therefore, the petitioners cannot insist upon this Court to let this contempt petition go on in a mechanical manner.


5. This contempt petition is, therefore, **closed**. The petitioners are left to their respective discretion for an appropriate legal course of action to be pursued in the matter.

6. Disposal of this contempt petition will not come to prejudice the petitioners, in case, they resort to appropriate legal course of action as a remedy available at their disposal.

7. Disposed of.

(RAHUL BHARTI)
JUDGE

JAMMU
02.07.2025
Shivalee



Whether the order is speaking : Yes/No
Whether the order is reportable: Yes/No