IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Appeal Case (Civil) No. 1 of 2026

M/s. MHR Construction Private Ltd. a company registered under the Indian Companies Act, 2013, having its registered office at Flat No.-P2/2303/2 B1, Priyabala Heritage (PBH), Marine Drive, Mauza Ulian, Thana No.1158, Ward No.2, New Khata No.468, Plot No. 21, Kadma, East Singhbhum, PO & PS Kadma, Dist. East Singhbhum, Jharkhand PIN 831005, through its Chief Executive Officer Sri Kunal Umar Singh (aged about 41 yrs) son of Late Dinesh Singh, Residence Flat No. P2/2303/2B1, Priyabala Heritage (PBH), Marine Drive, Ulian, PO & PS Kadma, Dist. East Singhbhum

... Appellant

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand
2. Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, at Near Old Court Campus, PO & PS Bistupur, Jamshedpur, Dist. East Singhbhum
3. Bhagirath Prasad father's name not known to the petitioner, Additional Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur, being Chairman of the Committee constituted in pursuance of the order dated 11.02.2025 passed in W.P(C) No.673 of 2025, at PO & PS Jamshedpur, Dist. East Singhbhum
4. Kumar Gautam father's name is not known to the petitioner, Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Dhalbhum, Jamshedpur, being member of the committee constituted in pursuance of the order dated 11.02.2025 passed in W.P(C) No.673 of 2025 at PO & PS Jamshedpur, Dist. East Singhbhum
5. Grindra Kumar Shyamal father's name is not known to the petitioner, wrongly described as Government Amin but actually Amin on contract basis, being member of the committee constituted in pursuance of the order dated 11.02.2025 passed in W.P (C) NO. 673 of 2025, at District Land Acquisition Office, PO & PS Jamshedpur, Dist. East Singhbhum

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ PRASAD

For the Appellant : Mr. V.P Singh, Sr. Advocate
Ms. Vandana Kumari Sinha, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Ashok Kr. Yadav, Sr. SC-I

---

02 /Dated: 23.09.2026

1. Heard Mr. V.P. Singh, learned Senior Advocate, who appears along with Ms. Vandana Kumari Sinha for the appellant and Mr. Ashok Kumar Yadav, Senior S.C-I for the respondents.

2. This appeal is instituted under Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 under section is directed against the learned Single Judge's order dated 20.3.2026 in Cont. Case (Civil) No.545 of 2025.

3. Mr. Ashok Kumar Yadav, learned Sr. S.C.-I objected to the maintainability of this appeal by pointing out that the impugned order only drops the contempt proceedings against the appellant. He further pointed out that no punishment has been imposed upon the appellant or its officers in exercise of the Court's jurisdiction to punish for that act. Accordingly, relying on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Ajay Kumar Bhalla & Ors. Vrs. Prakash Kumar Dixit*** (***2024) 12 SCC 159***, the present appeal would not be maintainable.

4. Mr. V.P Singh, learned Senior Advocate for the appellant, however submits that under Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 an appeal shall lie as of right from any order or decision of the High Court passed in a contempt petition. He submitted that

the impugned order was admittedly made in Cont. Case (Civil) No. 545 of 2025 and therefore, an appeal would lie against the same.

5. We have considered the rival contentions, but given the clear provisions of Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ajay Kumar Bhalla & Ors.*** (Supra) interpreting those provisions, we are satisfied that this appeal would not be maintainable. Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 provides that an appeal shall lie as of right from any order or decision of the High Courts in exercise of his jurisdiction to punish for the contempt. In this case the contempt proceedings have been dropped and therefore, there was no question of imposing any punishment on the respondents herein in the Contempt Case (Civil) No. 545 of 2025.

6. In ***Ajay Kumar Bhalla & Ors*** Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that an appeal under Section 19 lies only against the order imposing punishment for contempt and not against the order dropping the contempt proceedings or refusing to punish the alleged contemnors for contempt.

7. On the above grounds, we are satisfied that this appeal would not be maintainable and is required to be rejected for want of maintainability.

8. Further, we note that the impugned order had permitted the appellant to pursue its remedy in Writ Petition (C) No.5575 of 2025.

Therefore, it has not left the appellant herein for the rendered remediless by the impugned order.

9. For the above reasons we dismiss this appeal as not maintainable without any order for costs. The liberty granted by the learned Single Judge in the impugned order, no doubt stands.

(M.S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Manoj Prasad, J.)

September 23, 2026

Pramanik/Anjali
Uploaded on 28.09.2026