




IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3279 of 2016
In
C. REV. 10 of 2014

=====

Suo Motu Contempt Proceeding Initiated Against Defendent Petitioner In
C. Review 10/14 Through High Court Judicature At Patna

..... Petitioner/s

Versus

Urmila Devi & Ors

..... Respondent/s

=====

with

Civil Review No.10 of 2014
IN
SA 147 of 2012

=====

Urmila Devi & Ors.

..... Petitioner/s

Versus

Dr. Smt. Punam Sinha Raman

..... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :
(In MJC No.3279 of 2016)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shabir Ahmad
Mr. Shambhu Sharan Singh,
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ray Shivaji Nath
(In C. REV. No.10 of 2014)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shambhu Sharan Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mr. Ray Shivaji Nath

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH
ORAL ORDER

7 23-11-2016 **MJC No. 3279 of 2016**

Heard the parties.

A Suo Motu contempt proceeding has been initiated
against the opposite parties, who were the petitioners of Civil



Review No. 10 of 2014, disposed of by an order of this Court, dated 20.06.2016. The said order, dated 20.06.2016 and the order, dated 14.09.2016, speak for themselves. The present contempt proceeding has been initiated against the opposite parties under the presumption that they had re-entered the suit premises after they were evicted in execution of a decree.

It is not in dispute that as on date, the opposite parties are not in occupation of the suit premises. In compliance of this Court's order, dated 20.06.2016, the learned District and Sessions Judge, Purnea, has submitted a compliance report, mentioning therein that there is no dispute regarding execution of the decree, in question, in the light of this Court's order, dated 17.06.2013 passed in Second Appeal No. 147 of 2012 and subsequent order, dated 20.06.2016, passed in Civil Review No. 10 of 2014.

Learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the opposite parties, taking a line of least resistance, has tendered unqualified apology on behalf of the opposite parties. He has, however, reiterated that in fact, no case of willful disobedience of this Court's order, constituting contempt of Court, is made out.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the opposite parties, the contempt proceeding stands dropped.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

sunil/-c

U		T	
---	--	---	--