

D/L
Item No. 01
02.09.2025
KOLE
266306

**CPAN 1220 of 2025
With
WPA 12070 of 2025**

**Sandhyarani Mitra & Anr.
-Vs.-
Sri Samir Biswas, WBCS (Exe.)**

Mr. Barun Kumar Sengupta

.....for the petitioners.

*Mr. Pantu Deb Roy,
Ms. Pampa Lal Bandyopadhyay,*

...for the alleged contemnor.

This is an application alleging contempt of an order dated June 13, 2025, passed by this Court in WPA 12070 of 2025. The operative portion of the order dated June 13, 2025, reads as follows:-

“Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and having considered the material on record, this writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent no. 3 to take a decision on the petitioners’ application for renewal of permit made on April 3, 2025 together with the petitioners’ subsequent representation dated June 3, 2025 made to the said authority strictly in accordance with law, upon giving an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioners within a period of 10 days from the date of communication of this order.

It is needless to mention that the respondent no. 3 shall take a reasoned decision within the aforesaid time frame and communicate such reasoned decision within a period of one week from passing thereof.

WPA 12070 of 2025 stands disposed of with the above observation.”

On August 25, 2025 when the matter was taken up, the petitioners remained unrepresented but the learned Advocate appearing for the respondent handed up to the Court a copy of an order dated August 6, 2025, passed by the Secretary, State Transport Authority, West Bengal and submitted that the order dated June 13, 2025 had been complied with.

Today, Mr. Samanta, learned Advocate appearing for the applicants submits that although hearing has been given to the petitioners in terms of the order dated June 13, 2025 and a decision has been taken directing renewal of permit in respect of the one only. It is submitted that the permit was earlier applicable to two vehicles but after the hearing when the order dated August 6, 2025 has been passed, the permit has been renewed only in respect of one vehicle which is owned by Ms. Sandhyarani Mitra.

Mr. Samanta submits that the Secretary, State Transport Authority should be directed to pass an order directing renewal of the permit thereby making it operative in respect of the other vehicle also which owned by Nayan Mitra.

I am afraid, such order cannot be passed on a contempt application. It is well settled that in an application for contempt, the jurisdiction of the Court is very limited. The Court is only required to see whether or not there is any willful and deliberate violation of the order, contempt whereof has been alleged. The Court cannot in any way go beyond the confines of the order, contempt whereof has been alleged and alter the relief granted by the original order.

In such view of the matter, the request of Mr. Samanta cannot be acceded to. Since this court is of the view that the order dated June 13, 2025 has been complied with by the alleged contemnor, no order can be passed on this contempt application.

CPAN 1220 of 2025 stands disposed of without any order as to costs, leaving the petitioners free to take recourse to appropriate remedies available to them, in accordance with law.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties after completion of all necessary formalities.

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)