GAHC010248252026

2026:GAU-AS:16557

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/617/2026

SHAMSIA FAIZIA AHMED
D/O FARIDUDDIN AHMED, R/O VILL- NIZ DABOKA, P.O. AND P.S.- DABOKA, DISTRICT- HOJAI, ASSAM, PIN- 782440.

VERSUS

HARMEET SINGH, IPS AND ANR
THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, GOVT. OF ASSAM, ULUBARI, GUWAHATI- 781007.

2:NIRUPAM HAZARIKA
APS
SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
HOJAI
ASSAM
PIN- 78243

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S.A. Ahmed, Advocate

For the Respondent(s) : None appears

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH

ORDER

Date : 11.11.2026

This is an application filed alleging willful and deliberate violation of the order dated 20.03.2026 passed in WP(C) No. 2162/2025 whereby the learned Coordinate Bench of this Court issued directions upon the respondent Nos. 2 and 4 to complete the formalities of verification, sanction and ceiling so as to release the amount of Rs. 7,14,169/- to the petitioner within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the order. Paragraph 8 of the order, being relevant, is reproduced hereinunder:

> "*8. In view of the admission of liability of hire charges to the extent of Rs. 7,14,169/- by the respondent no. 4 and the broad consensus arrived at by the parties in the afore-stated manner, this Court is of the considered view that instead of keeping this writ petition pending, the same can be disposed of with a direction to the respondent authorities to complete the formalities of verification, sanction and ceiling so as to release the amount of Rs. 7,14,169/- to the petitioner within a period of 4 [four] months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. It is accordingly ordered. The petitioner shall submit a certified copy of this Order at the office of the respondent no. 2 and the respondent no. 4 so as to enable the said respondents to complete the entire process to facilitate expeditious disbursement of the admitted amount to the petitioner within the outer limit of the time period, mentioned above.*"

2. This Court has duly perused the materials on record including the contents of the contempt application.

3. From a perusal of the materials on record, nothing could be discerned that the 4 months' period has elapsed from the date of service of the certified copy. In fact, in Annexure-C to the contempt application, a date has been mentioned as 31.07.2026. Thus, the period of 4 months has not elapsed.

4. It is well settled that contempt proceedings can be initiated when there is a willful and deliberate violation of the directions passed by this Court. For the purpose of ascertaining as to whether there has been a willful and deliberate violation, an opportunity has to be granted to the opposite party.

5. In the instant case, nothing could be discerned that such opportunity was granted or for that matter, the period has elapsed from the date of service of the certified copy.

6. Considering the above, this Court, therefore, is not inclined to issue notice in the present contempt application and accordingly, the contempt application stands rejected.

7. Before parting with the record, this Court, however, observes that the rejection of the present contempt application shall not come in the way of the petitioner to submit a fresh representation along with the certified copy of the order dated 20.03.2026 passed in WP(C) No. 2162/2025 and after the expiry of the period, if the payment has not been released to the

petitioner after due verification, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach this Court.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant