

Mahadeo Oraon Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand & Ors. Opposite Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Praveen Chandra, Advocate Mr. Atul Rai, Advocate
For the Opp. Party Nos.1 & 2	: Mr. Suraj Prakash, AC to SC-VII
For the Private Opposite Parties	: Mr. Gaurav Raj, Advocate

08/08.05.2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. On perusal of the record, it appears that a writ petition being C.W.J.C No. 2383 of 1999(R) was filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 18.05.1999 passed by the Commissioner, South Chotanagpur Division, Ranchi in S.A.R Revision No. 120 of 1998 preferred by the opposite parties/interveners, whereby the said revision had been allowed setting aside the restoration order dated 13.12.1996 passed by the S.A.R Officer, Ranchi in S.A.R. Case No. 169/1993-94 and the order dated 15.07.1998 passed by the Additional Collector, Ranchi in S.A.R. Appeal No. 570 R 15/1997.

3. C.W.J.C. No. 2383 of 1999(R) was allowed by the Writ Court vide order dated 01.05.2009 quashing the order dated 18.05.1999 passed by the revisional authority i.e., the Commissioner, South Chotanagpur Division, Ranchi.

4. The interveners filed L.P.A No. 341 of 2009 and L.P.A. No. 342 of 2009 challenging the order passed by the Writ Court. Both the L.P.As were, however, dismissed for default vide order dated 11.04.2017 passed by the learned Division Bench of this Court. Subsequently, C.M.P. No. 201 of 2017 filed by the interveners seeking restoration of the aforesaid L.P.As was also dismissed for default vide order dated 05.12.2018.

5. In the year 2024, the petitioner filed a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 5461 of 2024 seeking issuance of direction upon the Circle Officer, Hehal, Ranchi (the opposite party no. 2 herein) to dispose of the petitioner's representation seeking restoration of the land in question as, according to him, the interveners had lost the litigation with respect to the said land. The said writ petition was disposed of directing the opposite party no. 2 to take up the representation of the petitioner as well as to issue notices to the concerned persons i.e., the opposite parties/interveners herein (who were said to be in possession of the land) and on verifying the fact that the orders passed in C.W.J.C No. 2383 of 1999(R), L.P.A. No. 341 of 2009 with L.P.A. No. 342 of 2009 and C.M.P. No. 201 of 2017 had not been set-aside till that date, to hand over the possession of the land to the petitioner in accordance with law.

6. The petitioner then filed the present contempt petition on 08.05.2025 seeking initiation of a contempt proceeding against the opposite party no. 2 (wrongly mentioned as opposite party no. 5 in the contempt petition) for intentional and deliberate violation of the Court's order dated 22.10.2024 passed in W.P.(C) No. 5461 of 2024.

7. During the pendency of the present contempt petition, an application being I.A. No. 2413 of 2026 dated 11.02.2026 was filed by 12 persons seeking intervention in the present case, which was allowed vide order dated 10.04.2026. The said applicants were the appellants of L.P.A. No. 341 of 2009 and L.P.A. No. 342 of 2009. In the said application, it was stated by them that altogether 11 settlement agreements were executed between them and the petitioner from 19.12.2019 to 29.12.2020, whereby they were permitted by the

petitioner to remain in possession of the land in lieu of payments of about Rs.1.08 crore made by them on different dates. The said factual aspect has not been denied by the petitioner in his rejoinder affidavit to the said I.A. filed by him on 05.05.2026. He has rather tried to explain the circumstances under which the said settlement agreements were executed and the amount was received by him.

8. The disturbing issue in this matter is that the petitioner while filing W.P.(C) No. 5461 of 2024 and the present contempt petition did not even whisper about the fact regarding execution of these 11 settlement agreements and receipt of Rs.1.08 crore by him paid at the instance of the opposite parties/interveners. Under the said circumstance, the Court is of the prima facie view that the petitioner has suppressed the material facts and has tried to mislead the Court, which also amounts to perjury.

9. Hence, the Court is of the view that Mahadeo Oraon – the petitioner of this case should be issued a show cause notice calling upon him as to why an appropriate order under the suitable provisions of law be not passed against him.

10. Issue fresh notice on the said issue to the petitioner.

11. Mr. Praveen Chandra, Advocate, appears and waives notice on behalf of the petitioner. He prays for and is allowed three weeks' time to file show cause affidavit on the said issue.

12. Put up this case under the heading "For Admission" on 19.06.2026.

13. The interim order dated 13.02.2026 shall continue until further orders.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

May 08, 2026
Manish