

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.419 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19009 of 2024

-
-
1. Durgawati Devi W/o Suresh Pandey, D/o Late Munni Lal Pandey, Resident of Village- Shivpur, Araj English, P.O. and P.S.- Lal Ganj, District- Ballia, Uttar Pradesh.
 2. Smt. Kamlawati Devi, W/o Madan Mohan Pandey, D/o Late Munni Lal Pandey, Resident of Village- Jhausa, P.O.- Belwania, P.S.- Behia, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.
 3. Asharfi Devi, W/o Sri Ram Pandey, D/o Late Munni Lal Pandey, Resident of Village- Jhausa, P.O.- Belwania, P.S.- Behia, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.
 4. Ashok Kumar Pandey, S/o Late Kripa Shankar Pandey, Grand Son of Late Munni Lal Pandey, Resident of Mohalla- Chitragupt Road, Bhriagu Ashram, Ballia, District- Ballia, Uttar Pradesh.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary Govt. of Bihar.
2. Sri Ansul Agarwal, I.A.S. the Collector of the District- Buxar, At and P.O.- Buxar, Bihar.
3. Sri Dhirendra Mishra, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Buxar, At and P.O.- Buxar, Bihar.
4. Sri Shubham Arya, The Superintendent of Police, Buxar, At and P.O.- Buxar, Bihar.
5. Sri Prashant Sandilya, the Anchal Adhikari, Buxar, At and P.O.- Buxar, Bihar.
6. Sri Sanjay Kumar, S.H.O., Industrial Area, Buxar, District- Buxar, Bihar.
7. Ramakant Pandey, s/o Late Ramjas Pandey, Resident of Village- Narhi, P.O. and P.S.- Narhi, District- Ballia, Uttar Pradesh.
8. Jitendra Nath Jai @ Lallu Rai, S/o Late Ram Nath Rai, Resident of Village- Baghauna, P.S.- Narhi, District- Ballia, Uttar Pradesh.
9. Sudhir Kumar Rai, S/o Late Batuk Nath Rai, Resident of Village and P.O.- Narhi, District- Ballia, Uttar Pradesh.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Brij Mohan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Arvind Ujjwal, SC-4
	Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC-4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 28-02-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and



learned AC to SC-4 for the State.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that a show cause on behalf of opposite party no. 2, 3 and 5 has been filed and from perusal of the pleadings made in the show cause, it would manifest that it has been specifically pleaded that the order of stay granted by this Court has not been violated nor any construction has proceeded after the stay order by this Court, as has been specifically pleaded at paras 5, 6, 11 and 14 of the show cause, on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that false statement has been made in the show cause and thus requires time for filing a reply to the show cause to bring on record the evidence to show that order of this Court has been violated on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that had there been any evidence with the petitioners in that event the same would have been annexed with the contempt application but then from perusal of the contempt application, it manifests that apart from bald pleadings no documentary evidence has been annexed. It is further submitted that there is presumption in favour of the officials that they will not lie before this Court and contempt is between the Court and the contemnor.

3. Considering the submissions made by the learned



State Counsel, the Court is not inclined to proceed with the contempt application.

4. Hence, the contempt application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

