

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 545 of 2025

M/s MHR Construction Private Limited, Kadma, East Singhbhum, through its
Chief Executive Officer, Sri Kunal Kumar Singh Petitioner
Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur
3. Shri Bhagirath Prasad, Additional Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur
4. Shri Kumar Gautam, Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Dhalbhum, Jamshedpur
5. Shri Grindra Kumar Shyamal (Amin) Opposite Parties

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner: Mr. V. P. Singh, Sr. Advocate
Ms. Ragini Kumari, Advocate
For the State: Mr. Anish Mishra, A.C to Sr. S.C-I

15/20.03.2026 The present contempt application has been filed against the opposite parties alleging wilful disobedience and non-compliance of the order dated 11.02.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No. 673/2025.

2. Pursuant to the order dated 13.03.2026, Mr. Sachidanand Mahato, Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Dhalbhum, Jamshedpur is physically present before this Court.

3. Mr. Anish Mishra, learned A.C to Sr. S.C-I appearing on behalf of the O.P.No.4, refers to the show cause affidavit dated 17.03.2026 filed on behalf of the said opposite party. Paragraphs 7, 8 & 9 of the said affidavit read as under:

"7. That in compliance of the aforesaid order dated 11.02.2025, a Committee was constituted vide memo no. 285(B)/Vidhi dated 19.02.2025 as per the direction of the Hon'ble Court.

8. That it is stated and submitted that the said Committee submitted its report dated 17.03.2025 to the Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur vide letter no. 553 dated 27.03.2025.

9. That it is humbly stated and submitted in further compliance of the order dated 11.02.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court, the answering opposite party No.2 i.e. the Deputy Commissioner, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur considered the

aforesaid report submitted by the Committee in J.P.L.E. Appeal No. 84 of 2024-25 and passed the final order dated 18.07.2025 in the said J.P.L.E. Appeal No. 84 of 2024-25.”

4. It is thus submitted that the aforesaid order of this Court has now been complied.

5. As against this, Mr. V. P. Singh, learned Sr. counsel for the petitioner, submits that the opposite parties have tried to overreach the aforesaid order of this Court as in terms with the said order, two Amins had submitted their reports dated 25.02.2025 clearly stating that the construction in question was not situated at public/government land i.e. Plot No. 55/2797. A similar report was submitted by another member of the Committee i.e. Sri Manoj Kumar Jha, Pleader Commissioner, Civil Court, Jamshedpur. Despite the said reports, the opposite parties, without seeking modification of the aforesaid order of this Court, proceeded to get a GIS mapping of the said plot done without giving prior information to the petitioner’s representative. In fact, the said GIS mapping was unilaterally got done by the opposite parties to somehow falsify the previous reports submitted by the Pleader Commissioner as well as the Amins with malafide intention to grab the petitioner’s land, which is not a government/public land.

6. It is further submitted by learned Sr. counsel that the petitioner has also got an independent GIS mapping of the plot in question done, according to which, the construction made by the petitioner is not over a government/public land. The said GIS map has also been approved by a government approved Civil Engineer. It is also submitted that if the reference point to measure the land in question was not available, then what promoted the Circle Officer to get the structure made over the land in question demolished.

7. It is therefore contended that the opposite parties are desperate to somehow prove their point that the said construction was made over the public land. Under the said circumstances, the petitioner has already preferred another

writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 5575/2025 in which interim order has also been passed in favour of the petitioner on 18.09.2025.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on consideration of rival submissions, though this Court is not satisfied with the mode of compliance of the order dated 11.02.2025 said to have been made by the opposite parties, however, considering that the present case is under the contempt jurisdiction in which rival factual contentions of the parties cannot be gone into and that the petitioner has already preferred a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 5575/2025, I intend to close the present contempt proceeding giving liberty to the petitioner to pursue its points in the said writ proceedings, few of which have been mentioned hereinabove.

9. The contempt proceeding as against the opposite parties is hereby dropped.

10. The present contempt application is accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

Satish/-

(RAJESH SHANKAR, J)