

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Writ Contempt No. 984/2018

1. Vinay Bansal S/o Shri Virendera Kumar Bansal, Aged about 46 years, C/o District Transport Officer, Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
2. Anil Mathur S/o Shri Pyare Lal Mathur, Aged About 53 Years, P.No. 408, Ligh Scheme No. 1, Nandanvan, Chopasani Road, Jodhpur, Rajasthan
3. Rajendra Dave S/o Shri Deen Dayal Dave, Aged About 56 Years, Mansagar, Mahamandir, Jodhpur Rajasthan
4. Prem Raj Khanna S/o Shri Girdhari Lal Khanna, Aged About 57 Years, Jk Nursing Home, Sardarpura, Jodhpur, Rajasthan
5. Niraj Shah S/o Shri Naveen Chand Shah, Aged About 45 Years, C/o Office Of District Transport Officer, Pratapgarh, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan
6. Nain Singh Sodha S/o Shri Vishan Singh Sodha, Aged About 54 Years, Laxmi Nagar, Jail Road, Barmer, Rajasthan
7. Khem Singh S/o Shri Udai Singh, Aged About 57 Years, Near Idukhan Chakki, Ganga Mata Mandir Ki Gali, Abu Road, District Sirohi, Rajasthan
8. Rajiv Tyagi S/o Shri Tara Chand, Aged About 52 Years, C/o Office Of The District Transport Officer, Jalore, Rajasthan

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Shri Rajesh Kumar Yadav, Secretary-cum-Commissioner, Transport Department, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Shri Niranjan Kumar Arya, Finance Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	: Mr. Ankur Mathur
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. Sudhir Tak, AAG with Mr. Saransh Vij

JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA

Order

26/04/2023

1. Mr. Ankur Mathur, learned counsel for the petitioners raised a grievance that the order under consideration was passed on

28.05.2015 in petitioner's favour in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1723/2001, yet the same has not been complied with.

2. It is noteworthy that aggrieved by the said order, an appeal was filed by the State, which was dismissed by the Division Bench way back on 23.11.2017 and SLP thereagainst too has been dismissed by the Supreme Court on 03.05.2019.

3. It is rather surprising and shocking to learn that in spite of the above and regardless of service of the notice of contempt, the contemnors have not cared to comply with the order passed by this Court.

4. Mr. Sudhir Tak, learned Additional Advocate General submits that the State is in the process of complying with the order dated 28.05.2015 and the matter is pending consideration before the Finance Department.

5. This Court cannot but refrain from taking serious exception to the approach of the respondents, as the same hits at the very confidence of the masses in the justice delivery system on the one hand and speaks volumes about the apathy of the bureaucrats towards the rights of the citizen on the other.

6. Let this case be listed on 17.05.2023.

7. In case the order under consideration is not complied with, the present Finance Secretary shall have to remain present in the Court on the ensuing date of hearing.

8. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order to the respondent No.2 and Principal Secretary Finance.

(DINESH MEHTA),J