

Anand Vijoy, aged about 61 years, S/o Late Umrao Mehta,
resident of Village-Kaji Chak Dhanawa, PO & PS-
Ramnathpur, District-Nalanda, PIN-811104 (Bihar)

... Petitioner

Versus

1.The State of Jharkhand

2.Sri L. Khiangte, age and father's name not known to the petitioner, presently working as Secretary, Department of Forest, Environment & Climate Change, Government of Jharkhand, Nepal House, P.O.-Doranda, P.S. -Doranda, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand)

3.Sri Saumitra Shukla, age and father's name not known to the petitioner, presently working as Division Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division, PO & PS-Medininagar, District-Palamau (Jharkhand)...

...Respondents/Opposite Parties

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD

For the Petitioners : Mr. Amit Kumar Das, Advocate
For the Respondents: Mr. Yogesh Modi, AC to AAG-IA

Order No. 07 : Dated 7th January, 2026

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for willful and deliberate non-compliance of order dated 16.06.2023 passed in W.P. (S) No. 936 of 2023, whereby and whereunder following direction has been passed:

“4.This Court, considering the aforesaid fact, is of the view that the matter at this stage is fit to be disposed of by relegating it before the Divisional Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division to take decision on the claim of the writ petitioner.

Such decision will be taken by the concerned respondent if due representation will be filed by the writ petitioner giving therein the entire details and annexing all supporting documents in support of his grievance within four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The concerned respondent will decide his claim and if he comes to conclusion that the writ petitioner is entitled for the remuneration as per the agreement in the contract, the same will be disbursed in his favour within the further period of two months from the date of such decision.

However, in case of any adverse decision, the same be communicated to the writ petitioner by passing a speaking order within the period aforesaid.”

2. The matter was heard on 12th November, 2025 and after hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court has called upon the Division Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division, Palamau to appear physically along with the record pertaining to the service profile of the petitioner showing mark of his attendance.

3. In pursuant to the said order, the extract of the attendance register has been filed.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the concerned Opposite Party that the joining of the petitioner was accepted from 19th January, 2023 and he has discharged his duty up-to 31st January, 2023 and thereafter only for a day i.e., 1st February, 2023, he has discharged his duty, which would be evident from the attendance marked by him from 19th January, 2023 to 1st February, 2023.

5. The Opposite Parties have filed show cause stating therein that upon verification of the official records, it was found that from 19.01.2023 to 01.02.2023, the attendance of the petitioner was recorded for which the honorarium has been paid. Therefore, submission has been made that nothing remains to be paid.

6. However, the said aspect of the matter has been disputed by Mr. A.K. Das, learned counsel for the petitioner by taking aid of the averment made in the reply to the show cause. It has been stated since the writ petitioner was assigned with the field duty as such he could not mark his attendance and to that effect the photographs have also been appended in proof of discharge of duty said to be of field duty.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties.

8. This Court, after going through the nature of the order passed by this Court in the writ petition, whereby the matter was relegated before the Divisional Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division to take decision on the claim of the writ petitioner and the Divisional Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division was directed to consider the claim of the writ petitioner for disbursement of the salary/remuneration on the basis of the performance of duty by the petitioner and in terms thereof, the salary/remuneration has been paid.

9. But this Court in order to consider the same also called upon the Divisional Forest Officer, Medininagar Forest Division to place on record the attendance register showing the mark of attendance and thereafter the extract of the attendance register has been filed. The claim of the petitioner that he has discharged his duty regularly and the writ petitioner was assigned with the field duty as such he could not mark his attendance, to that effect the photographs have also been appended.

10. But this Court is conscious of the fact that in the contempt jurisdiction no further direction can be passed which is being sought for by the petitioner to adjudicate the issue as to whether the writ petitioner was assigned with the field duty or not.

11. So far as admitted remuneration is concerned, the same has been admitted to be paid in favour of petitioner as per the attendance marked in the attendance register.

12. This Court considering the fact that no fresh direction can be passed under the jurisdiction of the Contempt of Courts Act, hence refrains from further proceeding in the contempt proceeding.

13. In view thereof, the instant contempt case is dismissed with liberty to the writ petitioner to ventilate his grievance, if any, before the appropriate forum.

14. With the liberty aforesaid, the contempt petition is disposed of.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

7th January, 2026

Alankar/