

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cont. Case (Civil) No. 1343 of 2025

Afream George Kujur, son of Late Norbert Kujur, resident of Kanke
Road, Bhitha, P.O.- Ranchi University, P.S.- Kanke, District- Ranchi
... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Commissioner of Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi
2. The State of Jharkhand
.... ... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Shubham Gautam, Advocate Mr. Sanket Khanna, Advocate
For the O.P. No. 1	: Dr. Vandana Singh, Advocate Ms. Aliza, Advocate Mr. Vivek Kumar Sharma, Advocate Ms. Shambhavi Singh, Advocate

<u>Order No. 06</u>	<u>Dated: 24.07.2026</u>
----------------------------	---------------------------------

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for initiation of contempt proceeding as against the opposite party no.1 alleging willful violation of order dated 30.09.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No. 5344 of 2024.
2. Dr. Vandana Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 1, refers to order as contained in memo no. 66 dated 04.04.2025 (Annexure-D to the show cause affidavit dated 22.07.2026) issued by the opposite party no. 1 and submits that the said opposite party by passing the said reasoned order has complied the aforesaid order of this Court.
3. As Against this, Mr. Shubham Gautam, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that though an arch erected at the instance of

“the Society of Divine Savior Church” has been removed by the municipal authorities, however further structures have not yet been removed.

4. Be that as it may. Considering the show cause affidavit filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 1 and also looking to the direction issued by the said opposite party vide his order dated 04.04.2024, this Court is of the view that the order passed in the aforesaid writ petition has substantially been complied. Hence, there is no need to further proceed against the opposite party no. 1 in the present contempt matter.
5. The contempt proceedings as against the opposite party no. 1 is hereby dropped.
6. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.
7. The petitioner is, however, at liberty to take appropriate recourse as permissible under law for redressal of his subsisting grievance.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

July 24, 2026
Ritesh/
Uploaded on 24.07.2026