



1

CONC-91-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK AGARWAL

ON THE 19th OF MARCH, 2025CONTEMPT PETITION CIVIL No. 91 of 2025*MAHENDRA KUMAR CHORNELE**Versus**MRINAL MEENA*

.....
Appearance:

*Shri Pravesh Naveriya - Advocate for the petitioner.**Shri Sumit Raghuwanshi - Advocate for the respondent.*
.....

ORDER

Shri Mrinal Meena, Collector, Balaghat is present in person.

2. It is informed by Shri Mrinal Meena, Collector, Balaghat that representation is already decided by him vide order dated 05.03.2025. Some of the dues have been paid and for remaining, bills have already been put before the Treasury and he undertakes to personally supervise that these bills are cleared within a period of 7 days' from today.

3. On such undertaking being furnished by the Collector, Balaghat, but not without observing a fact that this Court was constrained to issue bailable warrant seeking presence of the Collector, Balaghat on account of non presence, Shri Mrinal Meena submits that he had appointed a "*Sampark Adhikari*", though he admits that there is no provision for appointment of *Sampark Adhikari* in the matter of contempt and he shall not repeat this mistake in future, he further undertakes to take action against said *Sampark Adhikari*, who was appointed in the month of January and who chose to



sleep over the matter and not engage a counsel and file compliance report within time, on an undertaking furnished by the Collector, Balaghat that he has already moved to the appropriate authorities to take action against the delinquent *Sampark Adhikari*, contempt proceedings are dropped for the present, reserving a liberty in favour of the petitioner that if payment is not made within seven days as per the undertaking of the Collector, Balaghat, he will be free to move an appropriate application for revival of this contempt petition.

4. Before parting, it is necessary to reflect on the legal acumen of Government Advocate Shri Sumit Raghuwanshi, who has filed an application for cancellation of bailable warrant after it was served and the Collector has entered his presence. He is not in a position to point out from Cr.P.C. or BNSS as to the provision which permits filing of such application. Thus, it is evident that a superfluous application without any basis has been filed by the counsel and such practices should be curbed in future.

5. In above terms, the contempt petition is disposed of. Contempt proceedings are dropped and rule nisi is discharged.

(VIVEK AGARWAL)
JUDGE