

04
19.04.2024
mb

C.P.A.N. 1366 of 2023
in
W.P.A. No. 2420 of 2020

Rakshina Bewa & Ors.
Vs.
Mr. Subhan Das & Ors.

Mr. Golam Mastafa,
Mr. Tarasankar Samanta
... for the petitioners

Mr. Simanta Kabir,
Mr. Avik Pramanick
...for the alleged contemnors

1. The petitioners allege that regular payments were not made during the period as mentioned in the exception to the compliance report filed by the alleged contemnors.
2. However, learned counsel for the alleged contemnors painstakingly takes the court through relevant pages and the annexures of the compliance report and shows that, contrary to the allegations made in the exception of the petitioners, the payments for the months which were allegedly not paid for, had also been made at the relevant point of time to the petitioners.
3. Hence, the allegations made in the contempt petition are belied by the compliance report filed by the alleged contemnors.

4. Undoubtedly, there were certain delays on certain occasions. However, I find that there was substantial compliance of the direction of the court, therefore mitigating the necessity to issue a rule of contempt.

5. Accordingly, C.P.A.N. 1366 of 2023 is disposed of in the light of the above observations.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)