

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

D.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 286/2022

Gokul Chand Soni S/o Shri Sohan Lal Soni

-----Petitioner

Versus

Shri Ravi Jain

-----Respondent

Connected With

1. D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11153/2011
2. D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5102/2019
3. D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8224/2019
4. D.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 44/2025

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma Dr. Ganesh Parihar Mr. Pradeep Kumar with Mr. Waseem Ahmed Qureshi Mr. Parth Singh Dhakad Mr. Gaurav Choudhary Mr. Umang Jain with Mr. Anuj Rohilla Mr. Siddharth Sogani for Mr. Rajeev Surana, Sr. Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. RD Rastogi, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Devesh Yadav, Mr. Rajat Sharma, Mr. Kunal Sharma Mr. Ranvijay Singh for Mr. Anil Mehta, Sr. Adv. Mr. GS Gill, AAG Mr. BS Chhaba, AAG assisted by Ms. Shruti Pareek, AGC, Mr. Avinash Choudhary, Mr. Hardik Singh, Ms. Mansi Sharma Mr. Kapil Prakash Mathur, AAG with Mr. Ashutosh Udawat Mr. Sachin Singh Rathore for Mr. SS Naruka, AAG Mr. HV Nandwana Mr. Raj Kumar Goyal Mr. Punit Singhvi Dr. PC Jain Mr. Amit Jindal Mr. Lokesh Kumar Sharma Ms. Anjum Parveen Mr. Harshvardhan Shekhawat Mr. Mihit Katta

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU

Order

25/09/2025

1. Learned counsel for Mr. Ravi Jain, Secretary, Commissioner-Panchayati Raj Department, the District Collector, Jhunjhunu at the relevant time, submits that though the earlier report was that a part of the building being constructed by the Gram Panchayat was in तालाब का पायटन and this report was produced before the High Court to show that the action is being taken in compliance with the order of the Court. Later in 2018 on an oral request of Gram Panchayat a new team was constituted for re-inspection. The report submitted was that the building being constructed is not obstructing the flow of the water of the catchment area.

2. The two issues which need to be addressed at this stage are that once the order dated 17.02.2013 was passed upon a report submitted by the constituted committee and in compliance of the directions of this Court, what was the occasion for the Officer for ordering re-inspection and calling for a fresh report and that too without bringing it to the notice of the Court or seeking permission of this Court.

2.1. The second issue is that in the earlier report though there was finding that the building is not creating hurdle in the catchment area of the water flow from the east side but at the same time 0.1 hectare part of the building was तालाब का पायटन. The second report sought only talked about the catchment area and on the issue as to whether part of building was on the तालाब का पायटन was ignored.

4. Let officer remain present before this Court on the next date.
5. Mr. B.S. Chhaba, AAG and Mr. GS Gill, AAG appearing on behalf of respondents seek time to have instructions with regard to the stand of the State the way this matter has been dealt with and also on the issue of removal of encroachments and hurdles not only in the catchment area moreso, where the water resources were filled up to make them viable for construction.
6. Put up on 14.10.2025.

(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J

(AVNEESH JHINGAN),J