RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Contempt Petition No. 669/2024
CNR: RJHC020615282024 | URN: CCP / 723U / 2024

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

1. Late Saroj Agarwal D/o. Vishwanath Agarwal W/o. Shri Shiv Kumar Agarwal, R/o. Ganesh Nagar, Benar Road, Jhotwara (Raj.) (Since Deceased).
2. Shiv Kumar Kedia S/o Lt. Shri Sundar Mal Kedia, Resident Of 32, Kedia House, Nadi Ka Phatak Benar Road Murlipura, Jaipur (Rajasthan).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Ms. Manju Rajpal, Commissioner Jaipur Development Authority, Indira Circle, JLN Marg, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Shri Raj Kumar Verma, Deputy Commissioner, Zone-6, Jaipur Development Authority, Indira Circle, JLN Marg, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. Jaipur Development Authority, Through Secretary, Indra Circle, JLN Marg, (Raj.).
4. Anandhi, Commissioner, Jaipur Development Authority, Indra Circle JLN Marg Jaipur (Raj.).
5. Varsha Sharma, Deputy Commissioner, Zone-6, Jaipur Development Authority, Indra Circle, JLN Marg, Jaipur (Raj.).

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Aviral Goyal
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Amit Kuri with Mr. Dharma Ram, Mr. Ayush Sharma and Mr. Pinaky Paliwal

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

06/10/2026

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioners alleging non-compliance of the order dated 20.12.2023 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3028/2022.

(Uploaded on 09/10/2026 at 10:44:01 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:09 PM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

2. Vide order dated 20.12.2023, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while considering the specific averment made in the para 4 and 5 of the additional affidavit submitted by the respondents had directed the respondent - Jaipur Development Authority to do the needful exercise within a period of four months in terms of the order dated 04.07.2008 passed by the Appellate Tribunal, JDA. The para 4 and 5 of the additional affidavit submitted by the respondents reads as under:-

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

> *"4. That in the meantime vide order dated 8th September, 2014 issued by JDA, the present scheme namely "Deep Nagar" was transferred to the Nagar Nigam along with entire record of the scheme. However, as per the order of the learned Tribunal, due to non-availability of plot of equivalent size in the jurisdiction of JDA Zone-06, JDA had sought reports from various zones for allotting a plot of similar size and at a reasonable rate to the petitioner. The file is still under process in this regard.*
>
> *5. That after the completion of the earlier ongoing litigation between JDA and the petitioner in this matter, continuous follow up is being done to search for the plot. After this, after receiving the report from the other zone, JDA is willing to allot a plot of equivalent size in the Lohamandi scheme. But due to some litigation in the said scheme since the year 2018 and stay order of the Honble Supreme Court, the plot could not be allotted to the petitioner in that scheme. Now vide order dated 7.08.2023, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has stayed the interim stay order. It is also submitted that now after re-planning by JDA the map has been approved. Thus, after completing the due process, the lease deed will soon be issued to the petitioner as per law."*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the respondents clearly stated in their affidavit that a lease deed

(Uploaded on 09/10/2026 at 10:44:01 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:09 PM)

would be issued to the petitioners as per law but the respondents have not issued any lease deed to the petitioners so far.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in compliance of the order of the Court, the respondents examined the case of the petitioners through due process and have issued an allotment-cum-demand letter dated 21.05.2026 for Plot No. 401, Loha Mandi Scheme, Phase-I, Jaipur in favour of the petitioners. He further submits that the petitioners have not deposited the demand amount which is required for the issuance of the lease deed and due to non-depositing of demand amount, the lease deed could not be issued.

5. On consideration of the submissions made by counsel for the parties and the order dated 20.12.2023 which is subject matter of this contempt petition, it is revealed that the respondent - Jaipur Development Authority was to issue a lease deed in favour of the petitioners as stated in paragraph 5 of the additional affidavit and in paragraph 4 of the same it was also stated that the allotment and lease deed would be executed in favour of the petitioners at reasonable rates.

6. The respondents have accordingly issued an allotment-cum-demand letter to the petitioners for depositing the required demand amount for issuance of the lease deed but the petitioners have failed to deposit the demand amount within the given time.

7. Taking into consideration the contents of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the additional affidavit submitted by the respondent - JDA, as well as issuance of the allotment-cum-demand letter dated

(Uploaded on 09/10/2026 at 10:44:01 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:09 PM)

21.05.2026, this Court finds that the respondents have made substantial compliance of the order of the Court. Hence, there is nothing left to proceed against the respondents for contempt of Court.

8. Accordingly, the contempt petition is dismissed.

9. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

10. Contempt notices stand discharged.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

28/RASHMI

(Uploaded on 09/10/2026 at 10:44:01 AM)
(Downloaded on 19/11/2026 at 06:22:09 PM)