GAHC010093112026

undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/251/2026

MOHAN GOGOI
S/O SASHIDHAR GOGOI
BURHABURHI, P.O BHOLABORI, P.S NARAYANPUR, DIST LAKHIMPUR, ASSAM

VERSUS

SANJAY SINGHAL (IPS) AND ANR
THE DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF SASHASTRA SEEMA BAL (SSB), BLOCK NO.5 (EAST), RAMA KRISHNAPURAM, NEW DELHI-110066

2:SRI BHAKTI PRASAD SONOWAL
REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF STAFF SELECTION COMMISSION (NORTH EASTERN REGION)
HOUSEFEED COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI-78100

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. S ISLAM, A R MONDAL

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MEDHI

ORDER

06.10.2026

Heard Shri S. Islam, learned counsel for the petitioner, who by means of

this contempt petition has alleged willful and deliberate disobedience of the order dated 28.01.2026 passed by this Court in WP(C)/ 6757/2025.

On 18.05.2026, notice was issued in this case, pursuant to which Shri SS Roy, learned counsel has entered appearance on behalf of the respondent no. 1. Shri Roy, learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 has however submitted that the present petition filed for contempt is totally misconceived.

Shri Roy, learned counsel, by drawing the attention of this Court to the order dated 28.01.2026 passed by this Court in WP(C)/6757/2025, has submitted that as a matter of fact, the writ petition was dismissed and only an observation was made that if a representation was filed before the Review Medical Board seeking reconsideration, the same may be considered in accordance with law. He has submitted that in terms of the said observation, a representation was indeed filed by the petitioner which however was duly considered by the Review Medical Board and in that regard, a communication has been issued on 20.03.2026 which has been enclosed to the contempt petition itself. He submits that under those circumstances, it cannot be construed that there has been any deliberate and willful disobedience of the order of this Court.

Upon hearing the learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds force in the contention advanced by Shri Roy, learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 that the writ petition instituted by the petitioner was in fact dismissed and in pursuance to the observation of consideration of a representation, the same clearly appears to have been done and communicated, vide an order dated 20.03.2026. Though this Court would not make any comment on the legality / correctness of the said communication which is otherwise not the subject matter of challenge, the order of this Court clearly appears to be complied with.

In that view of the matter, the instant contempt petition clearly appears to be a misconceived one and accordingly, the same is closed.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant