IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 46 of 2025

1. Indra Bhushan Prasad Sinha, aged about 63 years, S/o Late Tej Narayan Singh, R/o: EWS 132, Harmu Housing Colony, P.O. Doranda, P.S.- Argora, District-Ranchi, (Jharkhand).
2. Syed Nasir Jamil, aged about 62 years, S/o: Late Syed Jamil Ahmad, R/o: 3k/78, Bariatu Housing Colony, P.O.+P.S. Bariatu, District-Ranchi 834009.
3. Sujata Sahay, aged about 67 years, W/o: Late Sunil Kumar, R/o C/97, Road No.1, Mandir Marg, Ashok Nagar, P.O.- Ashok Nagar, P.S.- Argora, District-Ranchi, 834002.
4. Shila Devi, W/o: Badri Thakur, R/o: Gram Kotwaldih, Ward No.1 Panchayat Urwan, P.O.+P.S.-Chandwara, District-Koderma (Jharkhand) Pin- 825409 **… … Petitioners**

Versus

1. Jitendra Kumar Singh, S/o: not known to the petitioners, Secretary Department of Industry, Project Bhawan, P.O.+P.S. Dhurwa, District: Ranchi.
2. Sudhir Kumar, S/o Not known to the petitioners, Regional Director, Jharkhand Industrial Area Development Authority, JIADA, Ranchi Region, JIADA Building, Namkum Industrial Area, P.O. Lowadih, P.S. Namkum, District: Ranchi.
3. The State of Jharkhand.
4. Secretary, Department of Finance, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O. + P.S. Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Opp. Parties

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Prashant Vidyarthi, Advocate
For the Opp. Party State : Mr. Arun Kumar Dubey, Advocate
For the Opp. Party No.2 : Mr. C. A. Bardhan, Advocate

25/**01.05.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. This contempt proceeding has been filed for initiating contempt proceedings against the opposite parties alleging non-compliance of order dated 21.02.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(S) No.6758 of 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the opposite parties has submitted that compliance report has been filed.

4. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that so far as the petitioners, except petitioner No.1, are concerned, they have no grievance.

5. So far as the order in connection with petitioner No.1 as contained in order No. 17 of 2026 dated 23.04.2026 is concerned, the learned counsel has submitted that the respondents have unilaterally change the date of entitlement of different pay scales of the petitioner. He has also submitted that the petitioner No.1 has retired in the year 2022 and in order to deny the benefits to the petitioner, the order dated 23.04.2026 has been passed. He has further submitted that the same is contrary to their own circulars.

6. However, considering the nature of the order passed in the writ petition, this Court is of the view that no further relief can be granted to the petitioner in contempt proceeding.

7. This contempt proceeding is hereby dropped.

8. Liberty is reserved with the petitioner to take steps in connection with the orders passed by the opposite parties as may be permissible under law.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

01.05.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded On:-04.05.2026