

HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

Present:
The Hon'ble Justice Jay Sengupta

CPAN 956 of 2025
In
WPA 6230 of 2025

Bijan Sikdar
Vs
Debasis Das, The Registrar, University of Calcutta

For the Petitioner/applicant : Mr. Sounak Bhattacharya,
Ms. Debapriya Mitra.

For the contemnor nos.2&5 : Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee,
Mr. Sourabh Sengupta.

Heard on : 06.05.2026

Judgment on : 06.05.2026

JAY SENGUPTA, J:

This is an application praying for issuance of Rule upon the respondent no.3/alleged contemnor being the Registrar of the University of Calcutta for the alleged violation of an order dated 21.03.2025 passed by this Court in *WPA 6230 of 2025*.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner/applicant submits as follows. By an order dated 21st March, 2025 passed by this Court in *WPA 6230 of 2025*, this Court directed the representation of

the petitioner dated 17.03.2025 to be considered by the Registrar of the Calcutta University in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order. The order was communicated upon the alleged contemnor on 25th March, 2025. Yet, no order was passed within the stipulated time. Instead, some other persons were promoted to the post in question. It was only after service of the contempt application that the alleged contemnor passed an order purportedly in compliance with the order. As some others had already been promoted to the post, it was a colourable exercise of power done by the alleged contemnor to circumvent the order passed by this Court. Therefore, it is clearly a case of deliberate and contemptuous violation of the Court's order.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the alleged contemnor opposes the prayer. He submits that although there was a delay in complying with the Court's order of passing a reasoned order on the representation of the petitioner dated 27.08.2025, the representation was considered in accordance with law and after assigning reasons, the prayer was considered and rejected. The petitioner can fairly challenge the said order before the appropriate authority, if aggrieved.

It appears that there was indeed a delay in considering the representation of the petitioner as directed by this Court. However, the same was done finally, by a reasoned order on 27.08.2025.

It would be open to the petitioner to challenge the same, if he is aggrieved by the same.

The whole purpose of exercising contempt jurisdiction is to enforce compliance of orders passed by this Court. The alleged contemnor has complied with the order passed by this Court, albeit after some delay and by a reasoned order. So, I do not find any reason to proceed any further in this matter.

Accordingly, the contempt application is disposed of without any further order, even as to costs. The notice is discharged.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J)