

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

**W.P. (PIL) No. 809 of 2022**

Pankaj Kumar Yadav ... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand and Others ... .. Respondents

-----  
**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**  
-----

For the Petitioner: Mr Rajeev Kumar, Advocate  
Mrs Niteshwari Kumari, Advocate  
For the State: Mr Vibhor Mayank, A.C. to A.G.  
For the ITD: Mr Kumar Vaibhav, Sr. S.C.  
Mr Durgesh Agarwal, Advocate  
For the ED: Mr Amit Kumar Das, Sr. Advocate  
Mr Saurav Kumar, Advocate  
-----

**11/Dated: 18.06.2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. Despite our previous orders, including the order dated 16.02.2026 by which we had directed the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent to file an affidavit, we are surprised that an affidavit has been filed only by the Chief Engineer and not the Secretary. The affidavit quotes our order of 16.02.2026, but it is silent about whether the Secretary who was granted time to file the affidavit subject to personally paying costs has actually paid such costs to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that to the best of his knowledge, the petitioner has not been paid any costs.
3. Even this affidavit of Chief Engineer refers to departmental enquiries against Officers initiated several years ago, but in most cases, the outcome of such action has not been disclosed. It is a vague statement about filing of FIRs, but again, the status of the FIRs is not disclosed.

4. Though we are inclined to issue a notice of contempt against the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, i.e. the Secretary, Department of Rural Development, we accept Mr Vibhor Mayank's request that the matter be placed after a week to enable him to obtain instructions.
5. We place the matter on 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 2026. In the meanwhile, we direct the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent and the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent alone to comply with the judicial directions and file a proper affidavit after paying costs of Rs. 10,000/- to the petitioner. If there is any difficulty in tracing the petitioner, the Secretary can deposit the costs in this Court.
6. The affidavit should firstly explain whether the Secretary was aware of this Court's order dated 16.02.2026 and if aware, the reasons why the directions therein or even the earlier directions for filing of affidavit were *prima facie* disobeyed.
7. We post this matter on 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 2026 for further consideration.

**(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)**

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

**June 18, 2026**

Manoj/Sharda/Cp.1