

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 514 of 2026

1. Kundan Kumar Singh, son of Jagdhari Singh
2. Atmara Choudhary, son of Siyaram Choudhary
3. Raghunandan Singh, son of Late Ram Suchit Singh
4. Manoj Mandal, son of Shankar Mandal
5. Sanjay Mandal, son of Late Govind Mandal
6. Bindeshwari Singh @ Dinjay Singh, son of Ramdular Singh
7. Navin Kumar Singh @ Navin Singh, son of Arun Singh
8. Upendra Singh, son of Shivji Singh
9. Chandan Kumar Singh, son of Ramdamodar Singh
All are residents of Sakrigali Ashram, P.O. & P.S.- Sahibganj,
District- Sahibganj Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2 Sri C.K. Das, presently posted as District Land
Acquisition Officer, Sahibganj Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioners : Mr. Piyush Kumar Roy, Advocate
For the O.P. No. 2 : Mrs. Omiya Anusha A.C. to A.A.G.-IA

Order No. 02

Dated: 19.06.2026

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 24.03.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No. 3475 of 2023.

2. A show cause affidavit has been filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 annexing a copy of order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the said opposite party observing inter alia that the petitioners have been found ineligible for rehabilitation and resettlement.

3. As against this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that an *ex parte* order dated 27.08.2025 has been passed by the opposite party no. 2 as no notice said to have been issued by the opposite party no. 2 was served to the petitioners. It is

also submitted that the said list of 485 displaced *raiya*s as mentioned in the order dated 27.08.2025, has not been given to the petitioner.

4. Perusal of the order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the opposite party no. 2 suggests that according to the said opposite party, the names of the petitioners have not been found mentioned in the list of 485 displaced *raiya*s and as such, the benefit of rehabilitation and resettlement has not been extended to the petitioners.

5. Since the opposite party no. 2 has already passed an order, this Court is of the view that the aforesaid order of this Court has now been complied. Hence, there is no need to further proceed in the present contempt matter.

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

7. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.

8. The petitioners are however at liberty to take appropriate recourse as permissible under law against the order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the opposite party no. 2.

9. It is however directed that the opposite party no. 2 being approached by the petitioner within two weeks from today, shall forthwith provide the list of the displaced *raiya*s for the project in question.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)