

10.04.2024
Item No. 12
Court No.6.
S. De

**C.R.C. 12 of 2023
in
MAT 1379 of 2022**

**Kalyani Das.
Vs
Mostafizur Rahaman.**

Ms. Pampa Dey (Dhabal)
...for the appellant/petitioner.

Mr. Santanu Kumar Mitra,
Mr. J.Roy Mukherjee,
...for the State.

Affidavit-in-reply filed by the petitioner be kept
with the records.

From the annexures to the supplementary affidavit filed in Court today on behalf of the alleged contemnor, it appears that the concerned Block Medical Officer of Health has passed an order dated January 10, 2024, in belated compliance of this Court's order dated February 6, 2023. This delay in compliance with the order and the requirement of issuing contempt rule before such order was complied with is not appreciated. Public officers are meant to comply with orders of Court within the time period prescribed and not at their own sweet will. Mr. Mitra, learned advocate representing the alleged contemnor offers unconditional apology for the delay. The

eloquence of Mr. Mitra persuades us to accept such apology.

Since the order has been complied with, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the contempt application pending. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the Block Medical Officer of Health, she has to challenge the same before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

C.R.C. 12 of 2023 is disposed of.

(Arijit Banerjee, J.)

(Apurba Sinha Ray, J.)