HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 1302/2025
CNR: RJHC020991782025 | URN: CCP / 1390U / 2025

Mateen Ahmed Son Of Shri Umar Khan, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of House Of Umar Thekedar, Ward No. 4, Near Roopangarh Road, Madanganj Kishangarh, District Ajmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Urban Development Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Vaibhav Gulriya, Secretary, Urban Development Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Jooekar Prateek Chandrashekhar, Director, Local Bodies, G-3, Rajmahal Residency, Near Civil Lines Phatak, C-Scheme, Jaipur.
4. Lok Bandhu, District Collector Ajmer, District Ajmer.
5. Seeta Verma, Commissioner, Nagar Parishad Kishangarh, District Ajmer.
6. Bhikha Ram Kala, Station House Officer, Police Station Kishangarh, District Ajmer.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Prakash Chand Yadav
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Sharma, AAG with Mr. Vishal Kumar

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

26/10/2026

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 08.08.2025 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15824/2018, whereby the writ petition was disposed of in view of the limited prayer made by the learned

Digitally signed by
ARTI SHARMA
Date: 2026.10.28
15:59:24 IST

counsel for the petitioner with a liberty to the petitioner to file application/representation alongwith all the relevant documents in support of his contentions and such representation/application was to be decided by the respondents by a reasoned and speaking order.

2. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents submits that the representation of the petitioner has been decided by a reasoned and speaking order dated 18.08.2026.

3. The order dated 18.08.2026 is also placed on record as Annexure- R-1.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondents while deciding the representation of the petitioner has taken into account the irrelevant considerations, which were not before the Court.

5. As far as the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that there are irrelevant considerations made by the respondents while deciding the representation is concerned, same cannot be adjudicated in a contempt jurisdiction.

6. Since the respondents have decided the representation of the petitioner, as directed by this Court, in opinion of this Court the respondents have made substantial compliance of the order of the Court.

7. Hence, this contempt petition is disposed of. Contempt notices stand discharged.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

52/ARTI SHARMA

Digitally signed by
ARTI SHARMA
Date: 2026.10.28
15:59:28 IST