

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Contempt Case (Civil) No. 132 of 2025

Jamni Devi, W/o Late Bimal Ram, R/o Birsa Nagar, P.O.- Amlo,
P.S.- Bermo, District- Bokaro **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
 2. Mr. K. Ramakrishna, The General Manager (B&K), Central Coal Field Limited, Kargali, P.O. & P.S.- Bermo, District- Bokaro. **Opposite Parties**
-

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY

For the Petitioner : None
For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. Saurav Kumar, Advocate

04/19.01.2026 None appears on behalf of the petitioner. However, Mr. Saurav Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 is present.

This contempt application has been preferred by the petitioner for initiating contempt proceeding against the opposite party no. 2 for willfully and deliberately violating the order of this Court dated 22.08.2023 passed in W.P.(S) No. 3223 of 2021.

The relevant part of the order dated 22.08.2023 passed in W.P.(S) No. 3223 of 2021 reads as follows:

“7. Since the dispute between the petitioners in both the writ applications has not yet been resolved by the respondent authorities as both the wives claim that their sons are eligible for being provided with compassionate appointment, both these writ applications stand disposed of with a direction to the respondent No. 5 in W.P.S. No. 4137 of 2020 (Project Officer) to consider the applications preferred by the respective petitioners for grant of compassionate appointment and come to a definite conclusion as to the person who is eligible for such appointment if the requisite criteria are fulfilled by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.”

A show cause has been filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 2, from which, it appears that the claim for compassionate appointment has been rejected by a reasoned

order dated 26.11.2025 primarily on account of the fact that no common consensus could be arrived at between the two wives of the deceased employee and that more than seven years have elapsed since the employee concerned had died.

However, considering the fact that the order in question has been complied with by virtue of the reasoned order which has been passed on 26.11.2025, I am not inclined to proceed further in this contempt application which accordingly stands disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

Dated, the 19th January, 2026
A. Sanga/-
Uploaded on 19.01.2026