



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CONTC No.4903 of 2023
CNR No. ODHC010550352023

Nilakantha Singh

....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv.—
Mr. Biren Sankar Tripathy, Advocate

-Versus-

**Mr. Suwendu Kumar Swain, Chief
Postmaster General, Odisha Circle
and another**

....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv.—
Mr. P.K. Parhi, Deputy Solicitor General of India
Mr. B.B. Mishra, Senior Panel Counsel

**CORAM:
HON' BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY**

Order No. **ORDER**
14.08.2026

16. 1. Pursuant to the Rule having served upon the alleged contemnor No.2, he is personally present in Court today and represented by Mr. P.K. Parhi, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India (DSGI) along with Mr. B.B. Mishra, learned Senior Panel Counsel.
2. An affidavit is sought to be filed showing the compliance of an order wherefrom it appears that a Circle Relaxation Committee (CRC) took up an issue and decided in clear violation of the mandates given in



the Malaya Nanda Sethy's Case. Though the direction was passed upon the alleged contemnor No.2 to take a decision, but an explanation is sought to be given that since he lacks an authority, he cannot decide the matter nor can take a decision. There is no step or an attempt on the part of the alleged contemnor No.2 when a final direction was passed in the writ petition in this regard or subsequent thereto, but appears to have proceeded casually, mechanically and in a lethargic manner in securing the compliance thereof. Even an explanation offered on a notice being served, this Bench finds the same unsatisfactory and directed the Rule to be issued as to why the alleged contemnor No.2 should not be punished under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act.

3. We had an occasion to peruse the decision of the CRC and as indicated hereinabove, there is a manifest violation of the direction passed by this Court and, therefore, we *suo motu* add the constituent of CRC as a party to the instant contempt application. Let the cause title be amended accordingly.

4. Mr. P.K. Parhi, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India holding a responsible post assures this Court that there would be a compliance of the order passed in the said writ petition and, in fact, he



has exercised his office in this regard in percolating the sense that the majesty and the sanctity of the order passed by this Court cannot be undermined nor to be whittled down taking a circuitous route.

5. In view of such assurances having given to this Bench and that too from the learned Deputy Solicitor General of India, we, thus, adjourned this contempt application to be listed on 21st August, 2026.

6. We find that the alleged contemnor No.1 has retired in the meantime and the service of the Rule was effected in the office which he held while in service and, therefore, such service cannot be said to be a good one. The petitioner is directed to amend the address of contemnor No.1 immediately and shall submit the requisites for effecting the service of Rule upon him.

7. The alleged contemnor No.2 shall remain personally present on the next date as well.

(Harish Tandon)
Chief Justice

(B.P. Satapathy)
Judge

S.K. Guin/PA