

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL**  
**Contempt Petition No.08 of 2026**

Sanjeev Kumar .....Applicant  
Vs.  
Sahil Ahmed ..... Respondent

Present : Mr. Nikhil Bhatt, Advocate holding brief of Mr. Dushyant Mainali,  
Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Devesh Ghildiyal, Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand.

**JUDGMENT**

**Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner has brought to the notice of the Court that the order dated 10.09.2024, passed in WPMB No.334 of 2024, Sanjeev Kumar Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others ("the first petition") has been willfully disobeyed by the respondent.

2. In the first petition according to the petitioner, the following reliefs were sought:-

- "i) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction declaring Section 2 of the Uttarakhand Agricultural Produce Marketing (Development and Regulation) Act, 2011 as ultra vires to the Constitution of India, to the extent wherein, it includes wood, which is a forest produce, within the definition of Agricultural Produce and its Entry b(i) of the Schedule of the Uttarakhand Agricultural Produce Marketing (Development and Regulation) Act, 2011, wherein, the wood as a forest produce has been specified as Horticulture Product subject to levy of Mandi Fee illegally.
- ii) Issue a writ of certiorari quashing the impugned G.O./Communication dated 12.10.2023, issued by the respondent no.1 whereby, the respondent no.3 Corporation has been authorized to recover Mandi Fee from commodity "wood", a Forest Produce scheduled in Uttarakhand Agricultural Produce Marketing (Development and

Regulation) Act, 2011 (annexed at Annexure No.1 to the writ petition).

- iii) Issue a writ of certiorari quashing the impugned orders dated 22.07.2024 and passed by the respondent no.2 and the pursuant notice dated 26.07.2024, issued by the respondent no.4, whereby, the petitioners have been directed to vacate the allotted plot for storage of their timber inside the premises of respondent no. (annexed at Annexure No.2 & 3 respectively to the writ petition)."

3. On the date of hearing, on 10.09.2024, the Court passed the following order with regard to status quo in the petition:-

"8. *Status quo*, as on today, will be maintained by the parties till the next date of hearing."

4. Now, it is being stated that the respondent authorities are not allowing the vehicles of the petitioner, which are carrying timber.

5. In the first petition, challenge was made to certain statutory provisions and the petitioner also sought quashing of the order, by which, they were directed to vacate the premises.

6. The Court has passed the *status quo* order in the first petition. The *status quo* only relates to the vacation of the premises. In the contempt petition, the scope may not be expanded. If now, any interference is done in the business activities of the petitioner, if advised the petitioner may move an application in the first petition or may seek such recourse as is permissible under the law. In the contempt proceeding, this Court may not proceed against the petitioner for the cause as shown, as it may not be termed as willful

disobedience of the order dated 10.09.2024, passed in the first petition.

7. The contempt petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(Ravindra Maithani, J.)  
08.01.2026

Sanjay

SANJAY  
KANOJIA