GAHC010128542026

2026:GAU-AS:10204

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/340/2026

M/S EDISON INTERNATIONAL AND ANR
A FIRM HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT 14, LOWER GROUND FLOOR, T.N. TOWER, A.T. ROAD, KAMRUP (M), GUWAHATI, ASSAM, PIN-781001.

2: HEMAN HALOI @ HEMEN HALOI
REPRESENTING M/S EDISON INTERNATIONAL
R/O 14
LOWER GROUND FLOOR
T.N. TOWER
A.T. ROAD
KAMRUP (M)
GUWAHATI
ASSAM
PIN- 781001

VERSUS

AMARJYOTI BORDOLOI AND 2 ORS.
THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER, INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED (IOCL), INDIAN OIL ADO STATE OFFICE, SECTOR-III, NOONMATI, P/O-NOONMATI, GUWAHATI-781020, ASSAM.

2:RINZING ONGMU BHUTIA
THE GENERAL MANAGER
L.P.G (OPERATIONS AND ENGINEERING)
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD. (AOD STATE OFFICE)
SECTOR-III
NOONMATI
P/O-NOONMATI GUWAHATI- 781020
ASSAM.

3:MUNIN BOKOTIAL
THE ENGINEER-IN-CHARGE
LPG BOTTLING PLANT

DIMAPUR
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD
NAGALAND - 797103

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. R K PRADHAN, MR. N N B CHOUDHURY,MR. S DAS,MR. K KASHYAP,MR. A K SAIKIA

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

Linked Case : Cont.Cas(C)/342/2026

M/S CREATION ADVERTISING AND ANR
A FIRM HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT GITANJALI BHAWAN
S.N. BOSE ROAD
DESHBANDHU PARA
P/O- SILIGURI TOWN
DIST-SILIGURI
WEST BENGAL - 734004

2: SOUMEN DAS
PROPRIETOR OF M/S CREATION ADVERTISING
R/O - GITANJALI BHAWAN
S.N. BOSE ROAD
DESHBANDHU PARA
SILIGURI
P/O- SILIGURI TOWN
DIST-DARJEELING
WEST BENGAL - 734004.
VERSUS

AMARJYOTI BORDOLOI AND 2 ORS.
THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED (IOCL)
INDIAN OIL ADO STATE OFFICE
SECTOR-III
NOONMATI
P/O-NOONMATI
GUWAHATI-781020
ASSAM.

2:RINZING ONGMU BHUTIA
THE GENERAL MANAGER
L.P.G (OPERATIONS AND ENGINEERING)

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD. (AOD STATE OFFICE)
SECTOR-III
NOONMATI
P/O-NOONMATI GUWAHATI- 781020
ASSAM.

3:MUNIN BOKOTIAL
THE ENGINEER-IN-CHARGE
LPG BOTTLING PLANT
DIMAPUR
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD
NAGALAND - 797103.

Advocate for : MR. R K PRADHAN
Advocate for : appearing for AMARJYOTI BORDOLOI AND 2 ORS.

Linked Case : Cont.Cas(C)/341/2026

M/S RHINO ENTERPRISE AND ANR
A PARTNERSHIP FIRM HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT SIMLAGURI
BARPETA ROAD
DIST- BARPETA
ASSAM - 781313.

2: RABIN CHANDRA DAS
PARTNER OF M/S RHINO ENTERPRISE
S/O- LATE RAJEN CHANDRA DAS
R/O- 519 SARPARA
KAMRUP
DIST- KAMRUP
ASSAM.
VERSUS

AMARJYOTI BORDOLOI AND 2 ORS.
THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED (IOCL)
INDIAN OIL ADO STATE OFFICE
SECTOR-III
NOONMATI
GUWAHATI-781020
ASSAM.

2:RINZING ONGMU BHUTIA
THE GENERAL MANAGER
L.P.G (OPERATIONS AND ENGINEERING)
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD. (AOD STATE OFFICE)

SECTOR-III
NOONMATI
P/O-NOONMATI GUWAHATI- 781020
ASSAM.

3:MUNIN BOKOTIAL
THE ENGINEER-IN-CHARGE
LPG BOTTLING PLANT
DIMAPUR
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD
NAGALAND - 797103.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. N.N.B. Choudhury, Sr. Advocate
Mr. A.K. Saikia, Advocate

For the Respondent(s) : None appears

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH

ORDER

Date : 24.07.2026

Heard Mr. N.N.B. Choudhury, the learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. A.K. Saikia, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners in the present batch of three contempt applications.

2. The present contempt applications have been filed alleging willful and deliberate violation of the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026 passed in three writ petitions, being, WP(C) No. 800/2026, WP(C) No. 804/2026 and WP(C) No. 805/2026. The relevant part of the said judgment and order are at paragraph Nos. 42 and 43, which are reproduced hereinbelow:

"*42. From the facts and circumstances obtaining as above, it is evidently established that the respondent IOCL authorities have arbitrarily denied the petitioners a real, meaningful and effective opportunity of being heard before being visited with the drastic penalty of the Holiday Listing for a period of one year by the impugned Orders, dated 22.01.2026. To take the action of Holiday Listing, the respondent IOCL authorities have referred to the Holiday Listing Guidelines dated 19.01.2023, which were issued much after the execution of the concerned Purchase Orders. By non-disclosure of the findings in the Vigilance Report and the Joint Inspection Report to the petitioners and at the same time, placing reliance on them to reach a satisfaction for taking the drastic measure of Holiday Listing and recovery, the respondent IOCL authorities have proceeded with in clear violation of the principles of natural justice and such an action is to be termed as one against all notions of fairness. For the above reasons, the impugned Orders dated 22.01.2026 are found not sustainable having failed to stand the scrutiny of law. Therefore, the impugned Orders dated 22.01.2026 are liable to be set aside and quashed and they are accordingly, set aside and quashed.*

43. Consequently, in view of the discussions and observations made, the findings reached at, and the order made, as above, the writ petitions stand allowed. There shall, however, be no order as to cost."

3. From a perusal of the above quoted paragraphs of the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026 passed in the three writ petitions shows that the learned Coordinate Bench of this Court had set aside and quashed the impugned orders dated 22.01.2026.

4. It is, however, pertinent to take note of that there is no specific direction in the said judgment and order to remove the

names of the petitioners from the Holiday List in which the petitioners had been placed pursuant to the orders dated 22.01.2026.

5. The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that in spite of the orders dated 22.01.2026 having been set aside and quashed, the names of the petitioners still features in the Holiday List and in that regard, has referred to page 137 of the additional affidavit filed pursuant to the order dated 24.06.2026 passed by the learned Coordinate Bench. This Court finds it relevant to observe that the said document at page 137 which is a part of the additional affidavit does not mention the date on which it came into existence. Under such circumstances, it cannot be presumed even prima facie that there is any willful and deliberate violation of the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026.

6. This Court further takes note of that the petitioners submitted a representation which was received only on 13.07.2026, i.e., much after the filing of the present contempt applications.

7. Under such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that no notice can be issued in the present three contempt proceedings, as this Court does not find that there has been any

willful or deliberate violation of the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026 passed in WP(C) No. 800/2026, WP(C) No. 804/2026 and WP(C) No. 805/2026.

8. Accordingly, the present contempt applications stand dismissed.

9. Before parting with the records, this Court finds it pertinent to observe that the orders dated 22.01.2026, whereby the petitioners were placed in the Holiday List, having been set aside and quashed by the learned Coordinate Bench in the judgment and order dated 06.05.2026 passed in WP(C) No. 800/2026, WP(C) No. 804/2026 and WP(C) No. 805/2026, the said orders dated 22.01.2026 have become nonest and under such circumstances, the respondent authorities, i.e., the Indian Oil Corporation Limited, cannot take note of the said orders dated 22.01.2026 whereby the petitioners were put into the Holiday List. If the petitioners are aggrieved at such action, it is a subsequent cause of action and the petitioners are at liberty to file separate writ petition(s), if so advised.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant