

12.09.2025
Item No.18
Court No.11
Avijit Mitra

**CPAN 671 of 2025
in
MAT 638 of 2021**

**Ramkrishna Das
- Versus -
Mr. Sidhdharth Majumder & anr.**

Mr. Anindya Lahiri, Sr. Adv.,
Ms. Biyanka Bhattacharya
...for the petitioner
Dr. Sutanu Patra,
Ms. Supriya Dubey
....for the contemnors

The present contempt application has been preferred alleging that the judgment delivered by this Court on 28th August, 2024 in MAT 638 of 2021, has not been complied with by the alleged contemnors. When the matter last appeared for hearing, we directed Mr. Lahiri, learned senior advocate appearing for the petitioner to file a supplementary affidavit. Let the said supplementary affidavit, as filed today, be kept on record.

A copy of the same has also been handed over to Dr. Patra, learned advocate appearing for the alleged contemnors.

Drawing our attention to the contents of paragraphs 39 and 40 of the judgment, Mr. Lahiri submits that though the petitioner came within the zone of consideration being a candidate amongst 713 candidates, who were directed to be considered, the Commission did not incorporate his

name in the final merit list and the panel published by the Commission.

He further submits that the petitioner was called for personality test on 3rd August, 2021 and thereafter, no steps were taken by the Commission and such act constitutes deliberate violation of the order of this Court. When the matter last appeared for consideration on 4th September, 2025, we directed Dr. Patra to avail necessary instruction.

Today, Dr. Patra tenders unqualified apology on behalf of the contemnors and submits that the petitioner is one of the 713 candidates, as referred to in paragraph 39 of the judgment, but inadvertently he was not called for counselling. He further submits, upon instruction, that such error has now been rectified and the petitioner would be called for counselling.

We accept the apology as tendered by the alleged contemnors and since it has been stated by Dr. Patra that the petitioner would be called for counselling, we are not inclined to proceed with the contempt application any further and the same is, accordingly, disposed of.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned advocates for the parties.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee,J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty J.)