

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 839 of 2025

1. Ajay Kumar Choudhary
2. Yogesh Bihari Verma
3. Hridya Ranjan
4. Manoj Kumar Singh
5. Satish Kumar
6. Vijay Kumar Singh
7. Manoj Kr. Singh
8. Ranjeet Singh
9. Satyendra Kumar Sinha
10. Dhananjay Kumar
11. Ladley Hasan
12. Subodh Kumar
13. Md. Firoz Ahmad
14. Vishal Kumar Ram
15. Yaswant Verma
16. Babita Shukla
17. Angel Tarun Bhowra
18. Punakant Dadel
19. Sushil Kumar Sharma
20. Smita Thakur
21. Chandra Mani Kachhap
22. Satish Kumar
23. Manoj Prakash

..... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Mr. Amitabh Kaushal, Secretary, Commercial Tax Department, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi

..... Opposite Parties

CORAM**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

For the Petitioners:

Mr. Saurav Arun, Advocate

For O.P.No.2:

Mr. Indranil Bhaduri, S.C-IV

08/10.04.2026 The present contempt application has been filed against the O.P.No.2 alleging wilful disobedience and non-compliance of the order dated 01.05.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(S) No. 6588/2022.

2. Mr. Indranil Bhaduri, learned S.C-IV appearing on behalf of the O.P.No.2, refers to the minutes of the meetings dated 29.07.2025 of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the minutes of the meetings dated 16.12.2025 of the Departmental Establishment Committee, the office order dated 18.12.2025 and letter No. 1706 dated 31.12.2025 (Annexures- A, B, C & E respectively to the show cause affidavit dated 20.01.2026) and submits that vide Annexures- A, B

& C, the petitioners along with the other persons of the Department of Commercial Taxes, Government of Jharkhand have been provided promotion from the post of LDC to UDC as well as from UDC to Head Clerk. Accordingly, they have also been given the related pay scale including the grade pay. So far as Annexure-E is concerned, the same has been issued with respect to the petitioner Nos 1 & 2 and one Chandan Kumar Mitra, who have not been provided promotion on the ground that on the date of consideration, they had already retired.

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

4. As against this, Mr. Saurav Arun, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the aforesaid minutes of the meetings/office order/letter cannot be said to be in true compliance of the aforesaid order of this Court as the authorities including the O.P.No.2 have not considered the petitioners' claim under the provisions of Rule 3(iv) read with Rule 8(i)(ii) of the Jharkhand State Commercial Taxes Department Clerical Services Cadre (Recruitment, Promotion and other Service Conditions) Rules, 2016. It is also submitted that as a consequence of the aforesaid decisions of the authorities, though the petitioners were having higher pay scale/grade pay by virtue of financial upgradations as a result of grant of first, second and third ACPs/MACP on the date of consideration, they have been put to the lower pay scale/grade pay. Thus, the said decisions of the authorities including the O.P.No.2 cannot be said to be in compliance of the aforesaid order of this Court.

5. Be that as it may.

6. Since the authorities including the O.P.No.2 have taken an appropriate decision in compliance of the aforesaid order of this Court, I am of the view that no case of contempt is made out against the O.P.No.2.

7. The contempt proceeding as against the O.P.No.2 is hereby dropped.

8. The present contempt application stands disposed of.
9. The petitioners are however at liberty to take appropriate recourse as permissible under law against the aforesaid decisions taken by the authorities.

Satish/-

(RAJESH SHANKAR, J)