

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 574 of 2025

Smt. Kalawati Devi, aged about 71 years, w/o Late Dipti Singh, resident of Dwarika Puri, Board No. 3, Power House Road No.3, Chutia, P.O. + P.S. Chutia, District-Ranchi. Petitioner

Versus

1. Shree A K Mishra, General Manager, South Eastern Railway, Garden Rich, P.O. + P.S. Garden Rich, District-Kolkata-700043.
2. Chief Commercial Manager (Name not know), S.E Railway, Garden Rich, P.O. + P.S. Garden Rich, District-Kolkata-700043.
3. Shree Arvind Kumar Singh, Chief Commercial Manager, Catering, South Eastern Railway, Strained Road, P.O. + G.P.O.-Kolkata, P.S. Strained Road, Kolkata, District- Kolkata-700001.
4. Shree Nishant Kumar, Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, South Eastern Railway, Ranchi Division, P.O. Hatia Railway Colony, P.S. Jagannath pur, District-Ranchi.
5. Shree Jasvinder Singh Bindra, Divisional Railway Manager,, South Eastern Railway, P.O. Hatia Railway Colony, P.S. Jagannathpur, District-Ranchi.
6. State of Jharkhand

... .. Contemnors /Opposite Parties.

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD**

For the Petitioner:	Mr. K. K. Jha 'Kamal', Advocate
For the UOI:	Mr. Anil Kumar, ASGI
	Ms. Niki Sinha, CGC
For the State:	Mr. Saurav Mahto, A.C. to G.P.-I

03/Dated: 29.07.2025

1. Heard.
2. The only direction passed by this Court while adjudicating W.P.(C) No. 3905 of 2024 is found in para-55 of the judgment dated 03.09.2024 which reads as under:-

"55. The respondents are directed to consider the claim of the writ petitioner subject to fulfilment of the conditions as available in the Catering Policy of 2010 and the Commercial Circular No. 22 of 2017, based upon the observation made

hereinabove, and take such decision in accordance with law within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order.”

3. It would be evident from the aforesaid that the only direction given to the respondents was to consider the claim of the writ petitioner subject to fulfillment of the conditions as available in Catering Policy of 2010 and Commercial Circular No. 22 of 2017, of course, based upon the observations made by the Court in the preceding paragraphs of its judgment and then take a decision in accordance with law within a period of three weeks.

4. No doubt, the respondents did not take a decision within the time frame as set out in the judgment, but that fact by itself could not constitute contempt. The respondents have passed a detailed consideration order dated 14.10.2024 and proposal therein would indicate that the same has been passed after taking into consideration the directions passed by this Court as well as the contents of Commercial Circular No. 22 of 2017 meaning thereby, that the directions passed by this Court have been duly complied with. If the petitioner is still aggrieved by the consideration order she is at liberty to avail of such remedy as available to her under the law, but under no circumstance, the petitioner can complain of violation of the order passed by this Court.

5. Accordingly, no case of contempt is made out. Notice is discharged. The contempt case is closed.

(Tarlok Singh Chauhan, C.J.)

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)