

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**Cont. Case (Civil) No. 1032 of 2025**

Raghunath Ganjhu, son of Bhuneshwar Ganjhu, resident of Village- Tektha (Tola Handu), P.O. & P.S.- Tandwa, District- Chatra

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Sri Vaibhav Kumar Singh, District Land Acquisition Officer, Chatra

.... ... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajiv Nandan Prasad, Advocate

For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. Shray Mishra, A.C. to A.G.

Order No. 04**Dated: 10.04.2026**

The present contempt petition has been filed for initiation of contempt proceeding as against the opposite party no. 2 alleging willful violation of order dated 09.04.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No. 1635 of 2025.

2. Mr. Shray Mishra, learned A.C. to A.A.G.-II, while producing a copy of order dated 24.01.2026 passed by the opposite party no. 2 in Case No. 02 of 2025, submits that vide said order, the opposite party no. 2 has disposed of the petitioner's representation with respect to his claim of compensation for acquisition of the land in question. It has been observed by the opposite party no. 2 in the said order that since the land is of "Gair Majarua Khas Khata", the petitioner's case is covered by letter no. 334 dated 14.05.2009 issued by the Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand and in paragraph-3 of the same, it has been mentioned inter alia that there is a provision

for consideration of such claim by a four-member committee headed by the Additional Collector of the concerned district. Accordingly, the opposite party no. 2 has ordered for sending the file to the competent authority for further needful.

3. It is thus submitted that the opposite party no. 2 not being the competent authority in deciding the petitioner's claim of compensation for acquisition of the land in question, he has rightly referred the matter to the competent authority to be considered by a four-member committee. Hence, the contempt proceeding as against the opposite party no. 2 may be dropped.

4. As against this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order dated 24.01.2026 passed by the opposite party no. 2 is completely unjustified and illegal.

5. Be that as it may. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and on consideration of the order dated 24.01.2026 passed by the said opposite party, this Court is of the view that no case of contempt is made out against the opposite party no. 2.

6. The contempt proceeding as against the opposite party no. 2 is hereby dropped.

7. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.

8. The petitioner is however at liberty to pursue the matter so as to be placed before the four-member committee as has been mentioned in the order dated 24.01.2026 passed by the

opposite party no. 2 in Case No. 02 of 2025. If no such decision in this regard is taken by the competent authority within a reasonable period, the petitioner will have the liberty to take other recourses in this regard as available under law.

9. The copy of order dated 24.01.2026 passed by the opposite party no. 2 in Case No. 02 of 2025 is kept on record.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

April 10, 2026
Ritesh/
Uploaded on 10.04.2026