

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Special Civil Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

**C.P.A.N. 201 of 2024
in
W.P.A. 4 of 2023**

**Subhendu Dhara
-versus
Sri. Giridhari Saha**

**Mr. Tarun Kumar Das.
...For the petitioner.**

**Mr. Gautam Lahiri.
... for the alleged contemnor.**

1. Affidavit-of-service filed today in Court be kept with the records.
2. The report of the Chairman of the Serampore Municipality dated 22nd November, 2023 has been annexed to the contempt application wherefrom it appears that the municipality sanctioned total amount of Rs. 4,97,240/- out of Rs. 7,46,090/- as claimed by the petitioner.
3. The reason ascribed for not sanctioning the billed amount is that the petitioner installed only 14 CCTV cameras instead of 18 CCTV cameras and he did not do any maintenance work of the CCTV cameras.
4. The petitioner disputes the contention as mentioned in the report and submits that he has all records in support of the submission that the work was carried out in accordance with the work order issued.
5. I am afraid that all the documents which the petitioner seeks to rely upon in support of the submission that work was done in accordance

with the work order, cannot be looked into in the contempt proceeding.

6. The contemnor has paid the admitted amount. The disputed amount remains unpaid.
7. It will be open for the petitioner to approach the competent forum for relief seeking release of the amount withheld by the municipality.
8. The contempt application stands disposed of.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)