

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 892/2025
CNR: RJHC020733372025 | URN: CCP / 951U / 2025

Balmukund Bhatt S/o Shri Manmohan Sharma, Aged About 74
Years, R/o Gujarati Mohalla, Choti Basti, Pushkar, Tehsil Pushkar,
District Ajmer

-----Petitioner

Versus

- Shri Lokbhandhu, District Collector, Ajmer, Address
District Collector Office, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305001
- Shri Dinesh Kumar Yadav, Tehsildar, Pushkar, Address
Teshsil Office Pushkar, District Ajmer, Rajasthan-305022
- Shri Janardhan Sharma, Adhishashi Adhikari Nagar
Parishad Pushkar, Address Nagar Parishad, Pushkar,
District Ajmer Rajasthan 305022
- State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Revenue
Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan 303902

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Ayushi Bansal & Mr. Stephee Joh for Mr. Mudit Singhvi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, Mr. Yadvendra Patel & Mr. Aryan Jagrat for Mr. G.S. Gill, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

11/08/2026

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioners
alleging non-compliance of the order dated 17.04.2025 passed by
the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in S.B. Civil Writ Petition
No.16775/2024.

2. By the order dated 17.04.2025, the Court directed the
petitioner to submit fresh detailed application before the

concerned authority raising their grievances within a period of three weeks. The respondents were also directed to decide the application by passing a reasoned order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that firstly; the respondents have not decided the application within given time and secondly; the respondents have not decided the application by a reasoned order.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the application submitted by the petitioner has been decided vide order dated 03.10.2025 by the Tehsildar Pushkar, District Ajmer after having considered the record and giving the reasons regarding conclusion of the application.

5. Learned counsel further submits that since the application was decided after considering the complete revenue record, it took time, and there was no ill intention of the respondents in deciding the application with a delay i.e. beyond the time allowed by the Court. He also submits that the respondents tendered their unconditional apology for delay in deciding the application.

6. Considered the submissions made by counsels for the respective parties and perused the material made available on record including reply submitted by the respondents.

7. The direction of the Court on 17.04.2025 was that the petitioner shall submit fresh detailed application before the Concerned Authority/respondents raising his grievances within a period of three weeks and if any such application is submitted by the petitioner within given time with the certified copy of the

order, the authority concerned was directed to pass a reasoned order on such application within a period of two months.

8. The petitioner has submitted an application to the Concerned Authority/respondents and the respondent i.e. Tehsildar Pushkar, District Ajmer vide order dated 03.10.2025 has rejected the application/representation of the petitioner. While rejecting the application/representation of the petitioner, detailed reasons have also been given on the basis of revenue record and therefore, it cannot be said that the order passed by the respondents in compliance of the order of the Court, is not speaking order.

9. As far as delay in passing the order on the application/representation is concerned, many times the time is consumed in collecting the record for deciding the application. On perusal of the order passed by the respondents, it is revealed that they have collected revenue record from various authorities.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents tendered his unconditional apology in passing the order and this Court in view of the facts of this case and the time consumed in collecting the revenue record, deems it just and proper to accept the unconditional apology tendered by the respondents for delay in deciding the application/representation.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and the fact that the application submitted by the petitioner has been decided by the respondents, in opinion of this Court that the respondents have made substantial compliance of the Court's order.

12. Accordingly, the present contempt petition, is hereby, dismissed.

13. Contempt notices stand discharged.

14. The petitioner would be at liberty to assail the order passed by the respondents on their application, if he feels aggrieved by the same before appropriate forum.

15. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

55/Ashish Kumar