



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CONTC No.1293 of 2026

1) Padmaja Manjari Swain

.....

Petitioners

2) Bishnu Charan Swain

Represented by Adv. –
B.C. Swain, Adv.

-versus-

1) Sanjay Kumar Singh, I.A.S

.....

Opposite Parties

2) J. Sonal, Collector Cum District
Magistrate, Jagatisnghpur

Represented by Adv. –

Mr. G. Mohanty, SC

CORAM:

MR. JUSTICE ANANDA CHANDRA BEHERA

ORDER

23.03.2026

Order No.

03. 1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Standing Counsel for the alleged contemnors are present.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that, the Judgment passed on dated 03.02.2026 in WP(C) No.31055 of 2025 relating to the direction to the Opp. Party No.1 (Collector, Jagatsinghpur) to permit/allow the petitioners for selling their yield paddy of the year 2025-26 either registering their names in PPS Portal or in otherwise immediately on production of the certified copy of the said Judgment before the Collector, Jagatsinghpur has not been complied.

4. In the previous date, the learned counsel for the petitioners had submitted a Letter No.607 dated 17.02.2026 of the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur addressing Principal Secretary to Government Food Supplies and Consumer Welfare Department, Bhubaneswar (Opp. Party No.1 in this Contempt Petition)



for taking appropriate suitable steps for compliance of the direction made in the Judgment passed on dated 03.02.2026 in WP(C) No.31055 of 2025, because, there is no scope at District Level for registration of farmers (petitioners), as the registration of farmers has already been completed/lapsed since 25.08.2025.

5. Therefore, in the last date on the basis of the above Letter No.607 dated 17.02.2026 of the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur, the learned Standing Counsel for the State had submitted to take instruction from the Opp. Parties for hearing of this CONTC on its next date, for which, the next date of the CONTC was fixed today.

6. Today, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that, in the meantime, the Judgment dated 03.02.2026 passed in WP(C) No.31055 of 2025 has been partly complied, because, token has already been issued in favour of the Petitioner No.2 (Bishnu Charan Swain) for selling his 22quintals and 4 K.Gs. paddy, but, no token has been issued in favour of the petitioner Padmaja Manjari Swain for selling her yield paddy.

7. When at one hand, the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur expressed through Letter No.607 dated 17.02.2026 that, there is no scope at the District Level for registration of farmers(petitioners) and wrote letter to the Principal Secretary to Government Food Supplies and Consumer Welfare Department, Bhubaneswar for taking suitable steps at State Level for implementation of the Judgment passed on dated 03.02.2026 in WP(C) No.31055 of 2025, but at the same time, on the other hand, the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur issued token in favour of the petitioner No.2 (Bishnu Charan Swain) for selling of his 22quintals and 4 K.Gs. paddy after registering his name, then, what



prevented the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur for issuance of token in favour of the petitioner Padmaja Manjari Swain.

8. It is the settled propositions of law that, when a direction is given through the Judgment of the High Court, the same needs to be complied fully, and part compliance thereof is not permissible.

Therefore, the learned Standing Counsel is directed to take instruction from the Collector and District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur regarding the cause of non-compliance of the part of the Judgment passed on dated 03.02.2026 in WP(C) No.31055 of 2025 in respect of non-issuance of token in favour of the petitioner Padmaja Manjari Swain for selling her yield paddy.

It has been clarified by the Apex Court in a decision between *Tata Mohan Rao vs S. Venkateswarlu & Others* reported in **2025 (4) Civ.L.J. (SC) 297** that, when an Order of the High Court is passed and the said order has not been varied and set aside, then, nobody should be permitted to disobey the Court's direction and in case of violation of Court's order, the directions given by the Apex Court in the case between *Tata Mohan Rao vs S. Venkateswarlu & Others* shall be resorted to.

9. List this matter after two weeks.

10. A free copy of this Order be supplied to the learned Standing Counsel for the alleged contemnors for transmission of the same to the Opp. Parties in course of the day.

(ANANDA CHANDRA BEHERA)
Judge

Rati Ranjan