

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (C). No. 117 of 2025

Krishna Chandra Choudhary Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand & Anr. Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner : Mr. Krishna Shankar, Advocate
For the Opp. Parties : Mr. Rahul Saboo, GP-II
Mr. Rishabh Kaushal, AC to GP-II

12/07.04.2026 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order passed by the Writ Court was twofold. Firstly, it was for direction to pay the salary to the petitioner in the pay-scale of Deputy Director, Agriculture-cum-Joint Controller (Weights & Measures), Ranchi from 16.12.2006, while he was post on the said post. Learned counsel fairly submits that he has received the said amount.

2. He further draws attention on the 2nd part of the order, whereby, the opposite parties were directed to calculate 20% of officiating pay for the post of Joint Agriculture Director-cum-Controller (Weights & Measure) and after calculating the same, pay the same to the petitioner. However, an order has been passed which is at Annexure-A to the show-cause dated 27.08.2025, wherein they have taken plea of Rule – 103 of the Jharkhand Service Code.

3. Pursuant to filing of the show-cause, the case was again listed on 08.10.2025, wherein it has been observed that there is some confusion as the opposite parties have calculated 20% officiating pay to the tune of Rs.250/- only which was not the purport of the order. Thereafter, fresh reasoned order has been passed, which has been annexed with the supplementary show-cause dated 12.01.2026, wherein again the same mistake has been done by taking resort to one circular of Finance

Department and finally it has been held that petitioner is entitled only for Rs.250/- per month. This goes to show that again the respondents are bent upon not to comply the order in true letter and spirit.

4. It has been argued by learned counsel for the opposite party-State that as per the Rule-103 of the Jharkhand Service Code and Circular of the Finance Department, petitioner is entitled only for Rs.250/- per month but the facts remains that the Writ Court in its order has categorically held as under:

“It is further directed that the respondents should also calculate 20% officiating pay for the post of Joint Agriculture Director-cum-Controller (Weights & Measure) and after calculating the same, pass an appropriate order with regard to payment of monetary benefit to this petitioner.”

5. It is further observed that neither any Appeal, nor any Review Application has been preferred against this order. Therefore, arguing anything on merit is certainly beyond the scope of the contempt proceeding.
6. By way of last indulgence to comply the order in true letter and spirit; meaning thereby to say, the opposite parties are directed to calculate 20% officiating pay for the post of Joint Agriculture Director-cum-Controller (Weights & Measure) and after calculation and also after deducting what has been paid to the petitioner @ Rs.250/- per month, pay the same before the next date of hearing, failing which Form-I will be issued.
7. List on 05.05.2026.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

7th April, 2026

Kunal/-