

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.543 of 2023
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11400 of 2008

=====

Kamal Narayan Jha Son of Late Srinarayan Jha, Resident of Village and Post-Rampatti, P.S. Rajnagar, District-Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Central Bank of India Registered Head Office Chandra Mukhi at Nariman Point, Mumbai through its Chairman and Managing Director Sri P.V. Rao.
2. Sri P.V. Rao, the Chairman and Managing Director Central Bank of India, Central Office, Chandra Mukhi Nariman Point, Mumbai.
3. Sri S.R. Das, the Chief Manager, HRD/CSD Central Bank of India, Central Office, Chandra Mukhi Nariman Point, Mumbai.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Durga Nand Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Parties	:	Mr. Ajay kumar Sinha, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, Advocate
	:	Ms. Zeba Akhtar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Amulya, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY
ORAL ORDER

7 28-09-2026 **1.** Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned Senior counsel for the opposite parties.

2. A preliminary objection has been raised by the Learned Senior counsel for the opposite parties, contending that the contempt petition has not been filed within the prescribed period of limitation.

3. For better appreciation, **Section 20** of ***the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971*** is reproduced hereinbelow:



“20. Limitation for actions for contempt.—

No court shall initiate any proceedings of contempt, either on its own motion or otherwise, after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the contempt is alleged to have been committed.”

4. On perusal of the order passed by this Court, it is evident that this Court disposed of the Writ petition, i.e. CWJC No. 11400 of 2008, on 28.02.2018. However, the contempt petition was filed in the year 2023.

5. With the above said observation, the contempt petition itself is not maintainable and, therefore, dismissed as devoid of merits.

6. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the order passed by the opposite parties subsequent to the disposal of the Writ petition in accordance with law.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Shanu/-

U			
---	--	--	--

