

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3392 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4094 of 2023

=====

Vidyadhar Pandey S/o Late Ambika Pandey, Resident of Village-Kalyanpur,
P.s.-Durgawati, District-Kaimur (Bhabua).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sawan Kumar, the Collector Kaimur (Bhabua).
3. Dr. Sanjay Kumar, the Addl. Collector, Kaimur (Bhabua).
4. Dushyant Kumar, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms Mohania, Distt.-Kaimur (Bhabua).
5. Lalit Mohan Sharma, The Superintendent of Police, Kaimur (Bhabua).
6. Laxman Singh, the Circle Officer, Durgawati Kaimur (Bhabua).
7. Dadhi bal Yadav, S/o Deolal Yadav, R/o Vill-Kalyanpur, P.S.-Durgawati, District-Kaimur (Bhabua).
8. Jitendra Yadav, S/o Late Ram Bachan Yadav, R/o Vill-Kalyanpur, P.S.-Durgawati, District-Kaimur (Bhabua).
9. Amrandra Pandey, s/o Late Lal Bahadur Pandey, R/o Vill-Kalyanpur, P.S.-Durgawati, District-Kaimur (Bhabua).

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ramakant Ram, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sajid Salim Khan (SC25)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

5 08-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel for the opposite parties.

2. The present contempt application has been filed for
non-compliance with the order dated 02.08.2023 passed in
CWJC No. 4094 of 2023.

3. A show cause has been filed on behalf of the
opposite parties along with Annexure-B, wherein it has been
stated that the encroachment from the land in question has been



removed at the instance of the Circle Officer, and that the petitioner is fully satisfied with the said action.

4. In light of the statement made in Annexure-B to the show cause, this Court is satisfied that the order under contempt has been substantially complied with.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has filed a reply to the show cause, wherein he states that although the direction regarding removal of encroachment has been complied with, the part of the order relating to protection being granted to him for construction of a boundary wall on the said land has not been complied with.

6. This Court, however, is of the considered view that the present circumstances do not fall within the purview of the Contempt of Courts Act.

7. Accordingly, the contempt proceedings are hereby dropped.

8. The petitioner shall be at liberty, if so advised, to avail his appropriate remedy under Rule 21 of the Bihar Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Rules, 2012, if so advised.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

