

GAHC010011302026



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

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/23/2026

1.ASSAM PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPERS LIMITED AND ANOTHER
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR PARTHA SARATHI CHOUDHURY
HAVING ITS REGISTEED OFFICE AT N.S AVENUE, SILCHAR, PIN-788005,
ASSAM

2: PARTHA SARATHI CHOUDHURY
S/O- PRAN GOPAL CHOUDHURY
R/O- SHIVALIK PARK MEHERPUR P.O AND P.S-SILCHAR
DIST-CACHAR PIN-788005 ASSAM

VERSUS

DR. RAVI KOTA, IAS
CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM, LOK SEWA BHAWAN,
JANATA BHAWAN, DISPUR, ASSAM, PIN-781006,

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. R. Singha, Advocate.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. S. Sarma, Advocate.

- B E F O R E -

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. ASHUTOSH KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

23.02.2026

(Ashutosh Kumar, CJ)

We have heard Mr. R. Singha, learned Advocate for the petitioners and Ms. S. Sarma, learned Advocate for the sole respondent.

A Public Interest Litigation (PIL No.17/2021) had been filed by the residents of Silchar town, raising a grievance regarding the decision taken by the erstwhile Silchar Municipal Board (now Silchar Municipal Corporation) to lease out a portion of the Gandhibag Park area of Silchar town to the petitioner No.1 (who was respondent No.9 in the PIL No.17/2021) to develop an amusement park and to construct hotel as well as commercial complex.

After hearing the grievance of the petitioners in the PIL, a Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 05.02.2025, had directed the Chief Secretary to the Government of Assam to constitute a three-Member Committee, to be headed by an officer, not below the rank of Additional Chief Secretary to the Government of Assam, to examine the aspects regarding violation of the Master Plan and environmental issues, if any, that is likely to arise with the establishment of the amusement park and construction of hotel and tourist complex over the land, which was sought to be leased out to the petitioner No.1 (respondent No.9 in the PIL) by the Silchar Municipal Board.

The said three-Member Committee, the Bench had directed, would complete the exercise within a period of 8(eight) weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of the order and shall submit its report, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the parties to the writ petition, and shall also communicate its decision to them immediately after conclusion of the proceedings.

When this time schedule was not adhered to in constituting the three-Member Committee, the petitioners have preferred this petition

seeking to initiate contempt proceeding against the answering respondents.

Today, Mr. R. Singha, learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that pursuant to the directions, referred to above, a Committee has already been constituted though after the time schedule fixed by the Court and the petitioner also has been called to participate in the deliberations.

This Court, therefore, is of the view that no issue arises for initiating contempt against the respondent and in fact, the contempt stands discharged.

The contempt petition is dismissed.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Comparing Assistant