

GAHC030003672025



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

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/19/2025

Lalnunthari
D/o Lalthuama, R/o D-30/a, PWD Tlang, Zarkawt, Aizawl, Mizoram

VERSUS

Sh Rajesh Kumar Singh and 6 Ors.
Secretary to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi -
1100112:Sh Govind Mohan

3:Sh A.K.Dhyani

4:Sh Shailendra Nath Gupta

5:Sh Khilli Ram Meena

6:Sh R.Lalramnghaka

7:Sh Er. Lalhriatpui

Advocate for the Petitioner : Ms Valentina Laldinpuii

Advocate for the Respondent : Mrs. Mary Lalruatkimi Khiangte for R7

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRANJAL DAS
JUDGMENT / ORDER**

Date : 25.02.2026

Heard Ms. Valentine Laldinpuii, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Ms. Zairemsangpuii, learned CGC for the respondent Nos. 1 to 5 and Mrs. Mary L Khiangte, learned Government Advocate for respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

2. The petitioner herein had filed a writ petition being registered as WP(C)/61/2023 primarily with grievance of not being granted the rental compensation for their lands which was occupied by Security Forces under the Ministry of Defence, Government of India since 1966. The writ petition was disposed of vide judgment and order dated 16.11.2025 directing the authorities to grant the rental compensation to the petitioner. The exercise was to be carried out within a period of six months where after interest @ 3% per annum was directed. The said order was taken up in appeal vide WA/7/2024 which came to be dismissed vide order dated 22.01.2025. Aggrieved by the non-compliance, the contempt petition was filed.

3. It is submitted on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 5 that the order has already been complied in the mean time.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner also confirmed that the order which is subject matter of the contempt petition has been complied with.

5. It is a settled position of law that contempt proceeding after being admitted is primarily an issue between the Court and the alleged contemnor and that, the contempt jurisdiction is not a mode of execution of the court's orders.

6. However, in the instant case, as the order in question passed by this Court and which had attained finality – has already been complied with by way of payment of rental compensation to the petitioner and the petitioner also does not have any grievances left – therefore, it would be just and fair to close this contempt proceeding as well.

7. In such view of the matter, the instant contempt proceeding is closed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant