

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2670 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10562 of 2019

=====

Ashish Kumar Singh Son of Dinesh Kumar Singh Resident of Village-
Hansdih, Police Station- Jamui, District- Jamui, presently residing at Street
No. 6, Mohalla- Jai Prakash Nagar, Bortand, Police Station and District-
Dhanbad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. through its Territory Manager (Retail),
Barauni namely Mr. Shubhang Dutt Pandey.
2. The Territory Coordinator (Retail), Barauni, namely Mr. Rahul Kumar.
3. The Manager Operation, Barauni TOP, namely Mr. Deepak Rajak.
4. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Jamui.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.
For BPCL	:	Mr. Siddhartha Pd. Adv.
	:	Mr. Om Prakash Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Siddhartha Prasad
For State	:	Mr. Arvind Ujjawal, SC4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

11 08-08-2025 The present MJC has been filed alleging the

deliberate violation of the order dated 16.01.2024 passed in

CWJC No. 10562 of 2019.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that

the petitioner pursuant to the order of this Court had made a due

representation to the authority and the authority had passed the

order on 21.11.2024 (Annexure-R/E). Learned counsel has

stated that the authority had passed an order without giving an

opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and further they have



relied on a report filed by a private handwriting expert for rejecting the claim of the petitioner. Learned counsel has further stated that this Court may be pleased to set aside the order dated 21.11.2024 and remand the matter back to the authority concerned for passing order afresh duly giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and directing them to send the disputed documents to a government handwriting expert for verification of the signature of the petitioner with that of those found on disputed documents.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Corporation has vehemently opposed the prayer sought for by the petitioner. Learned counsel has stated that pursuant to the directions from this Court, the authority had passed an order dated 21.11.2024 and in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the same, his remedy is to challenge the same by way of separate proceedings but the same cannot be assailed in the present contempt petition. Learned counsel has further stated that there is no violation of the orders passed by this Hon'ble Court and prayed for closing the present contempt petition.

4. Under giving a serious thought to the entire issue involved, it is to be noted that pursuant to the orders of this Court in CWJC No. 10562 of 2019 dated 16.01.2024 the



authority had passed the order on 21.11.2024. Whether the order passed by the authority is correct or wrong cannot be assailed in the contempt proceedings. The powers of the Court under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is very limited, the Court only has to see whether the orders passed by the Court have been complied with or not. In case the petitioner has any grievance, his remedy is to file separate proceedings challenging the said order.

5. Having regard to the same, the contempt stands closed leaving it open to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 21.11.2024, if he is so advised.

(A. Abhishek Reddy, J)

Ayush/-

U			
---	--	--	--

