

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4360 of 2024**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24359 of 2019**

=====

Bacha Singh son of Late Sant Bilash Singh, resident of Village-Surware Ke Bararhi, Police Station-Dinara, District-Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Smt. Udit Singh, the District Magistrate cum Collector Rohtas at Sasaram.
2. Santosh Kumar, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, District-Rohtas.
3. Md. Azaharuddin, the Anchal Adhikari, Dinara, District-Rohtas.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr. Jitendra Pd. Singh, Sr. Adv.<br>Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Adv.<br>Mrs. Sripriya Sinha, Adv. |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr. Standing Counsel 25                                                                 |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      11-04-2025                      Heard the parties.

2. The present application has been filed:

*for initiation of contempt  
proceeding against the opposite parties who  
have intentionally and deliberately violated  
the order dated 8.4.2024 passed by this  
Court in C.W.J.C. No. 24359 of 2019 by  
which His Lordships was pleased to direct  
the Opposite Parties to dispose of the claim  
of the petitioner within a period of four  
weeks.*

3. Pursuant to the last order, Mr. Santosh Kumar, son  
of Manohar Mahto, resident of Lower Burdwan Compound,



P.S.- Lalpur, District- Ranchi (Jharkhand) presently serving as **Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, Rohtas** is present in the Court.

4. The order was passed in the writ petition on 08.04.2024 in CWJC No. 24359 of 2019. The respondent-opposite party, Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, Rohtas was directed to take up the matter and after hearing the parties to dispose it of in four weeks.

5. The contempt petition came to be filed on 16.12.2024 and the submissions put forward by learned counsel for the petitioner earlier was that despite passage of so many months, the opposite party, DCLR, Bikramganj is sitting over the matter for the reasons best known to him. In that background, this Court on **26.03.2025** passed the following order:

*Heard Mrs. Sripriya Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Arif Daula Siddqui, learned AC to SC-25.*

*2. The present application has been preferred for initiation of contempt proceeding against the opposite parties who have intentionally and deliberately violated the order dated*



*08.04.2024 passed by this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 24359 of 2019 by which they were directed to dispose of the claim of the petitioner within a period of four weeks.*

*3. This Court passed a simple order on 08.04.2024, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, Rohtas (Santosh Kumar-opposite party no.2) was to take the Rent Fixation Case No. 01/2016-17 to its logical conclusion.*

*4. From the number itself, it shows that for 7-8 years, the case is pending before the said office.*

*5. The contempt petition was filed on 16.12.2024 i.e. eight months after the order was passed by the Court.*

*6. Certainly, if the DCLR, Bikramganj, Rohtas failed to take a decision by that time (16.12.2024), prima facie, this Court is of the opinion that the contempt is made out.*

*7. However, before taking further steps, it is important to hear the opposite party no.2, **Mr. Santosh Kumar, the DCLR, Bikramganj, Rohtas.***



*He is required to file his **personal show cause** and shall remain present in the Court on 11.04.2025 at 2:15 P.M. to reason out why contempt proceeding be not initiated against him.*

*8. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram (opposite party no.1) shall also be filing a show cause on the point whether any review of the cases pending before her subordinate offices are taken up or not as in this case, the number shows that it was registered **vide no. 01/2016-17** and not disposed of for several years.*

*9. List this case on **11.04.2025 at 2:15***

***P.M.***

6. The District Magistrate, Rohtas (opposite party no.1) has filed its counter affidavit and has informed that she is regularly interacting with her officials and has started reviewing the cases pending before her Subordinate Officers so that the directions are complied.

7. A show cause has been filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 2, Mr. Santosh Kumar, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, Rohtas in which he has not recorded anything on why he chose not to comply the order of



the High Court and passed an order within the time frame fixed. Instead the statement has been incorporated in paragraph 15 as follows:

*15. That thereafter opposite party no.-2 received record on 29.03.2025 and passed an order in Rent Fixation Case No.- 1/2016-17 directing that till disposal of appeal filed in the Court of Deputy Director, Chakbandi, Rohtas at Sasaram against the order dated 03.03.1993 passed in Chakbandi Padadhikari, Dinara vide Appeal No.- 79/2024-25, the Rent Fixation Case No.- 1/2016-17 shall remain stayed till disposal of Appeal No.-79 of 2024-25.*

8. By deliberately disobeying the order of the High Court and further not detailing out the reason why the order could not be complied, clearly, a contempt is made out against the concerned official, Santosh Kumar, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Bikramganj, Rohtas.

9. As the Court took steps for initiating Contempt proceedings against him, at this stage, the concerned official submits that the delay on the part of the Circle Officer, Dinara,



Rohtas led to the ultimate delay in passing the order, he has all respect for the order of Patna High Court and submits sincere apology for not passing the order in time, particularly, before 16.12.2024 when the petitioner, a 85 years old person was forced to file the contempt petition.

10. The further submission is that henceforth he shall be diligent in complying the orders of the Court. He further submits that whether the order is of Hon'ble Apex Court, Patna High Court or from the Civil Court, the same will be taken care of and steps shall be taken as per the directions issued.

11. Mr. Jitendra Prasad Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the apology rendered by the opposite party no. 3, he may be let off after warning. As stated, though this Court wanted to initiate contempt proceeding against the official, in view of the fact that he is young, has joined the service only in the year 2018 and appreciating the stand taken by Mr. Jitendra Prasad Singh representing the petitioner that he be let of as he has submitted his sincere apology, the Court do not intend to proceed further in the matter.

12. However, the petitioner who was forced to file contempt petition as the opposite party no. 2 chose not to dispose of his case, he has to be compensated from the pocket of



the officer concerned. Thus, the opposite party no. 2 is required to pay a cost of Rs. 5,000/- to the learned counsel for the petitioner for forcing him to file the Contempt petition.

13. As an order has been passed by the O.P. no. 2 on 29.03.2025, allowing the petitioner to take recourse to legal remedy, the contempt petition stands disposed of.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Vijay Singh/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

