

GAHC010011012024



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

**Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/44/2024**

SMTI. BORNALI UZIR AND 2 ORS  
W/O SHRI MONIMANTA SAIKIA, D/O SMT. BULU BORA UZIR, R/O VILL-  
HOWRAGHAT TINIALI, MOUZA LANGPHER, P.O. KACHUPUKHURI, P.S.-  
HOWRAGHAT, DIST KARBI ANGLONG, ASSAM, PIN-782482

2: SMT. KAKULI UZIR  
W/O SHRI MANJIT KUMAR BORA  
D/O SMT. BULU BORA UZIR  
R/O VILL-HOWRAGHAT TINIALI  
MOUZA LANGPHER  
P.O. KACHUPUKHURI  
P.S.-HOWRAGHAT  
DIST KARBI ANGLONG  
ASSAM  
PIN-782482  
P/R/A H/NO. 1  
HOUSEFED VILLAGE  
BYE LANE 22  
JURIPAR PATH  
SIX MILE  
GUWAHATI  
DIST- KAMRUP (METROPOLITAN)  
ASSAM  
PIN-781022

3: SMT. JUNALI UZIR  
W/O SHRI JITU DAS  
D/O SMT. BULU BORA UZIR  
R/O VILL-HOWRAGHAT TINIALI  
MOUZA LANGPHER  
P.O. KACHUPUKHURI  
P.S.-HOWRAGHAT  
DIST KARBI ANGLONG  
ASSAM PIN-78248

VERSUS

SUDIP BHATTACHARJEE  
VALUATION OFFICER (INCOME TAX), OFFICE OF THE VALUATION CELL,  
INCOME TAX DEPARTMENT, AAYAKAR BHAWAN, 7TH FLOOR, CHRISTIAN  
BASTI, G.S. ROAD, GUWAHATI, DIST- KAMRUP (METROPOLITAN), ASSAM,  
PIN-781005

**Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A J SARMA**

**Advocate for the Respondent :**

**BEFORE**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANISH CHOUDHURY**

**22.01.2024**

Heard Mr. G. Alam, learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner has preferred the instant petition, styled as a contempt petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971 and the provisions of the Gauhati High Court Rules alleging non-compliance of the directions made in an order dated 16.10.2023 passed by this Court in a writ petition, WP(C) 5708/2023.

It is noticed that in the said writ petition, WP(C) 5708/2023, the petitioner was impleaded as party respondent no. 10. It is also relevant to quote the following observations made in the order dated 16.10.2023 (*supra*);

*“If the land owners continue to feel aggrieved in the matter event thereafter, it would be open for them to approach this Court again, by filing appropriate writ petition.”*

Thus, it is evident from the order dated 16.10.2023 that if the petitioners

as the land owners continue to feel aggrieved in the matter, then liberty is reserved to the petitioners to approach this Court by filing appropriate writ petition. However, instead of preferring a writ petition in compliance of the direction made in the order dated 16.10.2023 (supra), the petitioners have preferred a petition, styled as a contempt petition.

In the above view of the matter, the instant contempt petition is not entertained and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. Liberty, however, stands reserved to the petitioners to file appropriate writ petition, if so advised.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**