

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AT NEW DELHI
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 701 OF 2021

IN

T.C. (CIVIL) NO.2 OF 2004

IN THE MATTER OF

B.M. BEDI, MEMBER,
COMMITTEE – GFIL

... CONTEMPT PETITIONER

VERSUS

SHRI RAMJI SHARAN SHARMA
ADDITIONAL COLLECTOR (E),
DEHRADUN

... ALLEGED CONTEMNOR

INDEX

Sr.	Particulars	Date	Page
1	Additional Affidavit by Committee		
2	Annexure A 1: English Translation of Order passed by the Chairman, Revenue Board, Uttarakhand	19.3.2020	
3	Annexure A 2: Show Cause Notice sent by Committee	20.7.2021	
4	Annexure A 3: English translation of the Reply to the show cause notice	10.8.2021	

Filed On: _____
New Delhi

(SOUMYA DUTTA)
Advocate of Contempt Petitioner

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AT NEW DELHI
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 701 OF 2021

IN

T.C. (CIVIL) NO.2 OF 2004

IN THE MATTER OF

B.M. BEDI, MEMBER,
COMMITTEE – GFIL

... CONTEMPT PETITIONER

VERSUS

SHRI RAMJI SHARAN SHARMA
ADDITIONAL COLLECTOR (E),
DEHRADUN



... ALLEGED CONTEMNOR

ADDITIONAL AFFIDAVIT BY THE COMMITTEE – GFIL
(APPOINTED BY THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT)

I, Brij Mohan Bedi, S/o Shri Sadhu Ram Bedi, aged about 71 years,
R/o H. No. 22, Sector-4, Panchkula, Haryana, do hereby solemnly
affirm and state as under:-

1. That I am one of the members of the Committee appointed by the
Hon'ble Supreme Court on 19.8.2004 and reconstituted by the
Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 20.12.2016 under directions of
Hon'ble Supreme Court. I am duly authorised and being fully
competent and fully conversant with the facts and circumstances
of the case, I am competent to swear this affidavit.

Brij



2. That the Contempt Petition is filed in view of deliberate, willful and intentional disobedience of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by the alleged contemnor.


After filing the present contempt petition, the Committee came to know about another order which was also passed after the prohibitory order dated 14.1.2020 passed by this Hon'ble Court on Revenue Courts, Dehradun. This time it is Chairman of the Revenue Board, Uttarakhand at Dehradun.

3. That the Committee received a notice dated 19.2.2020 through an email dated 19.2.2020 in the matter of Reeta Aggarwal Vs State of Uttarakhand from Additional Collector (E) Dehradun.

Thereafter, due to Covid 19, countrywide lockdown was imposed and when the courts resumed functioning, the counsel of the Committee filed preliminary objections before Additional Collector (E) on 30.12.2020. During the course of hearing in March 2021, the counsel of the Committee while procuring copies of every case listed before Additional Collector (E), discovered that the case has already been decided by the Revenue Board, Uttarakhand.

4. That, while attending a hearing of some other matter before Revenue Board, Uttarakhand on 27.3.2021, the counsel of the Committee inspected the case file of Reeta Aggarwal and found that Reeta Aggarwal filed Revision No. 88 and 88(1) /2020 before the Revenue Board, Uttarakhand against the main order dated 2.6.2003 passed in Case No. 15A of 1999-2000 and that the said

Amis



T
rader
handi
R.A
V.T.

revision has been decided by Sh. S. Ramaswami, Chairman, Revenue Board, on 19.3.2020. English translation of the order dated 19.3.2020 passed by Sh. S. Ramaswami in the capacity of the Chairman of Revenue Board, Uttarakhand is annexed as **Annexure A-1.** (Pg ____ to Pg ____)


Since Sh. S. Ramaswami, has passed final order on 19.3.2020 i.e. after 14.1.2020 therefore amounts to violation of this Hon'ble Court order dated 14.1.2020.

5. That a Contempt of Court Notice dated 20.7.2021 was sent to Sh. S. Ramaswami IAS (Retd.) regarding his passing final order dated 19.3.2020 in Revision No. 88 and 88(1) / 2020 in his capacity as Chairman, Revenue Board, Uttarakhand in violation of Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 14.1.2020. Copy of Contempt of Court Notice Dated 20.7.2021 is annexed as **Annexure A-2.** (Pg ____ to Pg ____)

6. That Sh. Ramaswami vide his reply dated 10.8.2021 has stated that he was unaware of the prohibitory order dated 14.1.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as the same was not communicated to him till the time he held the office. He further stated that the Secretary, Uttarakhand informed the Revenue Board about the Supreme Court order only vide letter dated 25.8.2020.

In his defense, Sh. Ramaswami has pleaded that he passed the order dated 19.3.2020 in good faith and therefore the notice may be withdrawn. English translation of his reply letter dated 10.8.2021 is annexed as **Annexure A-3.**

Amis



7. That the petitioner feels it is necessary to bring this order to the kind knowledge of the Hon'ble Court about passing of yet another order by the Revenue Court at Dehradun after the prohibitory order dated 14.1.2020 passed by this Hon'ble Court as apprehended in the Contempt Petition.
8. In view of the above, it is respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to take on record Annexure A-1 to A-3



DEPONENT

VERIFICATION:-

I, the deponent above named, do hereby verify and state that the contents of paragraph 1 to 8 of this affidavit are true to my knowledge derived from the records of the case and no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed there from.

Verified by me at on this the 16th day of September, 2021.


DEPONENT



ATTESTED

PRADEEP KUMAR
Notary, Chandigarh (U.T.)

.16 SEP 2021

COPY OF ORDER DATED 19.03.2020

BEFORE THE LEARNED REVENUE COUNCIL,
UTTRAKHAND, DEHRADUN.

Revision No.88(1)/2020

Under Section 219 of Indian Revenue Act

1.Smt. Rita Aggarwal daughter of late Ved Parkash Goel
(Wife of Dr. S.K. Aggarwal) resident of Sahastradhara
Enclave, M.D.D.A Colony, Dehradun.

2.Smt. Sangita Garg W/O Ajay Garg resident of 42/1, Block-
2, Bhandari Bagh, District Dehradun.

3.Rattibhan Singh son of Late Risaldar Mukhtiar Singh
resident of 110, Indira Nagar Colony, District Dehradun.

Versus

Tehsildar, Vikasnagar, Janpad, Dehradun.

Present: S. Ramaswami, Hon'ble President.

ORDER:

This revision has been filed with regard to the order dated 15.01.2020 passed in previous Revision No.88/2018 in the case of Smt. Rita Aggarwal etc. Versus Tehsildar, Vikasnagar the compliance of the above said orders has not been made by the Collector, Dehradun. Therefore, the letter dated 22.02.2020 sent by Smt. Rita Aggarwal daughter of late Ved Parkash Goel (Wife of Dr. S.K. Aggarwal) resident of Sahastradhara Enclave, M.D.D.A Colony, Dehradun has been treated as revision.

The details facts of the revision are that:

This Hon'ble Court has conducted a joint inquiry regarding land measuring 0.4250 hectare comprised of KhasraNo.586situatedat Village Jhajhra Tehsil Vikasnagar through Revenue Sub Inspector, Revenue Inspector Jhajhra, Naib Tehsildar, Revenue Council and Tehsildar, Vikasnagar has been got conducted on dated 30.12.2019 and the report in this regard has been presented before this learned court on dated 30.12.2019 by the Sub Divisional Officer, Vikasnagar. After that vide order dated 15.01.2020 passed in Revision No.88/2018 titled as Smt. Rita Aggarwal etc. Versus Tehsildar Vikasnagar, the Collector Dehradun was directed that from the enquiry report as well as from the record presented by the revisionist, it is clear that new

Khasra numbers have been made in place of old Khasra No.586 and the KhasraNo.1171Kh is comprised of land measuring 0.4250 hectare and it was entered in the name of Gram Sabha as a 'JangalJhari' which has been transferred on the name of Nanak son of Chunu vide order dated 22.09.1997 (Copy of the order and summons are enclosed). The entry of transfer of this land was done vide order dated 04.05.2006 (Copy of order and summons are enclosed)passed by Assistant Collector, Vikasnagar along with Khatano.526 Khasrano.39K area 0.2290-hectare Lal Chander son of Nathu Ram resident of Sanai Colony, Dehradun. Lal Chand had further sold this land and in the end, the revisionist had purchased this land. But it was wrongly forfeited to the state government after. It is necessary to make corrections.

Collector, Dehradun did not made compliance of the orders and vide order dated 12.02.2020 deemed the land in dispute pertaining to Golden Forest and transferred case no. 15A/99-2000 to the learned court of Deputy Collector, Administration, Dehradun where the case was pending. The revisionist had presented letter dated 22.02.2020 against the same and it was treated as revision petition and the revision petition which was pending before the Ld. Deputy Collector, Dehradun was called back by the Ld. Collector Dehradun and has been called in this learned court for

examination under Section 333 of the Zimidara Abolition and Land Reforms Act.

As per the detailed enquiry report qua the Khasrano.586 and the land belong to Golden Forest which was forfeited to the state government through case no. 15A/1999-2000 and as per the report of Record Keeper and Regional Revenue Inspector, the total area of old Khasra number 586 is 1.6190 hectare i.e., 4 acres. (1359 Copy of the Khasra numbers of crops is Annexure-A). As per old Khasra number 586 and consolidation 1400, the area of new Khasrano.1171Khis 0.4250-hectare Jangal Jhari, 1171G area 0.0360 hectare, Purani Parti, 1171J area 0.3080 Hectare. Uttaranchal Government 1172K area 0.1670. Purani Parti 1172Kh area 0.0770 hectare, Prem Kumar son of Murli 1172G area 0.4040 Gulfam etc. and 1172Gh area 0.2020 the land is on the name of Mohammad Sadiq being transferred land. Therefore, the land comes to 1.6190 hectare i.e., 400 acres. Khasra No.1171Kh comprised of land measuring 0.4250 hectare and on dated 28.07.2001 and on dated 22.09.1997 the land has been changed from the Jangal Jhari to the name of Nanak son of Chuna as the holder of land through transfer. The learned court of Assistant Collector 1st Grade, Vikasnagar through its order dated 22.06.2003 passed in case No.15A/1999-2000 has deemed the land measuring 1.1640 hectare comprised of

KhasraNo.586 of Golden Forest Company and forfeited the same to the state government. From the matching of the record, it has been found that in the bandobast fasli file no.1400, at that time the land measuring 0.4040 comprised KhasraNo.1172G is in the Khata no. 84 on the name of Gulfam and Manglu, land measuring 0.0770 comprised of Kharano.1172Kh in Khata No.183 on the name of Prem son of Murli land measuring 0.2020 hectare comprised of KhasraNo.1172ghin Khatano.365 on the name of Mohammad Sadiq son of Dini and thus total land measuring 0.6830 have been recorded as land owners through transfer. On dated 22.09.1997, the land measuring 0.4250 hectare comprised of Khasra no. Kh was approved and regulated on the name of Nanak son of Chuna and it was incorporated in the Bandobast volume on dated 28.07.2001. Golden Forest Company and its associate companies had purchased the land in the year 1995-96 and 1997. At that time the land 0.6830 was comprised of KhasraNo.586 Min was recorded in the name of Khata holders having transfer rights. But as per the order dated 02.06.2003 passed by the Assistant Collector 1st Grade Vikasnagar incase No.15A/1999-2000, the land has been described in the old KhasraNo.586 measuring 1.1640 situated in Gram Jhajhra and this land has been deemed to be of Golden Forest and has been forfeited to the state government. The land which

is 0.4810 excessive in the land of Khata holder, has been forfeited. From the report received from Record Keeper and Revenue Inspector as well as from the perusal of the record, it has been found that the land measuring 0.4810 is comprised of old land Khasra No. 586 situated in Village Jhajhra, Pargana Pachhwadun, Tehsil Vikasnagar, Janpad Dehradun has been deemed as the excess land than the land of Khata holders and it has been deemed that this land has been sold to the Golden Forest Company and therefore the same has been forfeited to the state government. This land (Gram Samaj Land) has been wrongly forfeited to the state government. The name of the revisionists has been mentioned in the case on the basis of sale deed. As per the case No. 15A/1999-2000, the land measuring 0.4810 belong to state government. Because in the case No. 15A/1999-2000, the land measuring 0.4810 has been wrongly forfeited to the state government, which was belong to Gram Sabha and as per the above said orders, this land is still recorded on the name of state government. Regarding the land in question, the case No. 15A/1999-2000 is pending in the court of Learned Collector, Dehradun and the amendment in the same can only be made by the concerned court. It is appropriate to make amendment on the name of purchasers from earlier of Gram Jhajhra, transferred to the name of Nanak son of Chunu and then came to Khata holder Lal

Chand and then the same was purchased by other purchasers. The revisionist has the right to implead as a party before the learned Court of Collector, Dehradun and can put his claim for making entry the land on her name.

From the above said enquiry report, it is clear that new Khasra numbers have been made in place of old KhasraNo.586 and the KhasraNo.1171Kh is comprised of land measuring 0.4250 hectare and it was entered in the name of Gram Sabha as a 'Jangal Jhari' which has been transferred on the name of Nanak son of Chunu vide order dated 22.09.1997 (Copy of the order and summons are enclosed). The transfer of this land was done vide order dated 04.05.2006 (Copy of order and summons are enclosed) passed by Assistant Collector, Vikasnagar along with khata no. 526 Khasra no.39K area 0.2290-hectare Lal Chander son of Nathu Ram resident of Sanai Colony, Dehradun. Lal Chand had further sold this land and in the end, the revisionist had purchased this land. But it was wrong forfeited to the state government. Therefore, the revision petition is accepted and the land in dispute is not liable to be forfeited to the state government.

ORDER.

The revision is accepted and the order whereby the land measuring 0.4250 hectare comprised of old

KhasraNo.586 and new KhasraNo.1171Kh has been forfeited to the state government, is hereby set aside and hereby pass order to make entries in the revenue record on the name of transferee Nanak son of Chunu and then to Khata holder Lal Chand and then to the names of other purchasers/revisionists. Tehsildar Vikasnagar is ordered to lawfully make entries accordingly in the revenue record on the name of purchasers/ revisionists and the compliance be made within a period of one week and to inform.

SD/- S. Ramaswami, President.

The order has been pronounced today on dated 19.03.2020 in the open court.

SD/- S. Ramaswami, President.

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE TRANSLATED COPY

ADVOCATE

COMMITTEE – GOLDEN FORESTS (INDIA) LIMITED

(Appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India)

Chairman's Off : # 1065/1, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh -160 036 Tel : 0172 -2695065

E-mail : committee_gfil@rediffmail.com www.goldenforestcommittee.com

COM/CHD/Br-251/2021/

July 20, 2021

Shri S. Ramaswamy, IAS (Retd.)

Chief Commissioner

Uttarakhand Right to Service Commission

1 Chalang Hills, Post Office,

Sahastradhara Rd, Kulhan,

Dehradun, Uttarakhand 248013

Sub: Contempt of Court Notice

1. The State of Uttarakhand initiated proceedings u/s 166-167 of UP Zamindari Abolition & Land Reforms Act, 1950 against the M/s Golden Forests (India) Limited and its associate/subsidiary companies in the year 1997, which are still pending before Additional Collector (Finance and Revenue) and Additional Collector (Establishment) Dehradun.
2. In the matter of Case No. 15A of 1999-2000, Assistant Collector Dehradun passed order dated 2.6.2003 vide which lands of Golden Forests India Limited in Uttarakhand were declared surplus.
3. Aggrieved by this order, a third party Ms Reeta Aggarwal filed objection by way of Case No. 11 of 2019-20 before Additional Collector (Establishment) Dehradun that her land comprised in khasra

no. 1171 (kh)measuring 0.4250 hectare is owned by her and therefore be excluded from the holding of Golden Forest (India) Limited.

4. The Committee received notice dated 19.2.2020 for hearing on 22.2.2020 (Saturday). Thereafter, due to Covid 19, countrywide lockdown was imposed and when the courts resumed functioning, the counsel of the Committee filed preliminary objections before Additional Collector (E) on 30.12.2020.
5. Recently, during the course of hearing before Additional Collector (E), it came to the knowledge of the counsel of the Committee that Ms. Reeta Aggarwal has also filed Revision No. 88 and 88 (1) /2020 before the Revenue Board, Uttarakhand against the main order dated 2.6.2003 and that the case has been decided by you being Chairman, Revenue Board on 19.3.2020. On 25.6.2021, the counsel of the Committee received certified copy of the order dated 19.3.2020 which is enclosed herewith for your ready reference.
6. It may be noted that since the proceedings u/s 166/167 were pending before revenue authorities for a very long time, therefore Committee filed I.A. No. 145178 of 2019 in WP(C) No. 188 of 2004 before Hon'ble Supreme Court and requested the Hon'ble Court to decide the surplus matter of lands located in State of Uttarakhand.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court has been pleased to issue notice and State of Uttarakhand has filed its reply. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further directed the parties to file proposed issues and as per order dated 14.1.2020, the Hon'ble Court directed the Revenue Authorities at Dehradun not to pass final order in the surplus land matters relating to

the company Golden Forests (India) Ltd without taking permission from the Supreme Court and in this regard statement of counsel of the State of Uttarakhand has also been recorded in the order itself. The relevant paragraph of order dated 14.1.2020 reads as under:

“It was stated by the learned counsel appearing for the State of Uttarakhand that the Uttarakhand Authorities are proceeding to take up the matter of Urban Land Ceiling Act, it is assured on behalf of the learned counsel that no final orders are going to be passed without the permission of this Court.

Statement of the learned counsel is placed on record. This is sufficient to take care of the grievance raised by Ms. Suruchii Aggarwal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Committee.

With respect to surplus land, counter affidavit has been filed. Let rejoinder to that, if any, be filed by the Committee within three weeks.”

Copy of the order dated 14.1.2020 is annexed as **ANNEXURE A-1**.

7. This is also a violation of orders dated 17.8.2004 and 15.10.2008 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in T.C.(C). 2 of 2004. Order dated 15.10.2008 was passed in the presence of counsel of the State of Uttarakhand however order dated 17.08.2004 was reiterated in order dated 5.09.2006 which was passed in the presence of counsel of the State of Uttarakhand.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 17.8.2004 passed in the matter of T.C. (c) No. 2 of 2004 barred other courts to entertain any claim filed against M/s Golden Forests (India) Limited. The relevant portion of the order dated 17.8.2004 is reproduced as under:

“By Order dated 12th September, 2003 we directed that no other Court except this Court shall entertain any winding up proceedings relating to the Respondent-Company. We now direct that no other Court or Forum or Tribunal will entertain any claim or application by depositors/investors for return of monies or payment of interest as these aspects will be dealt with by this Court after realization of all the assets. If any such claim is filed by any party before any Court or Tribunal the same shall stand stayed. We clarify that criminal cases are not covered by this Order and can proceed.”

Copy of the order dated 17.8.2004 is annexed as ANNEXURE A-2.

Vide order dated 15.10.2008, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of T.C. (c) No. 2 of 2004 directed that if there is any third party claim over any of the property of Golden forest group that shall be considered by this Committee and pass appropriate order. The relevant portion of order is reproduced as under:

“In order to facilitate the disbursement due to the investors, the money has to be collected by selling these properties. The Committee is authorized to take possession of all the properties owned by the respondents. If there are any valid claims in respect of

any of these properties by third parties, the Committee may consider the same and pass appropriate orders, subject to confirmation by this Court”

Copy of order dated 15.10.2008 is annexed as ANNEXURE A-3 and copy of the order dated 05.09.2006 is annexed as ANNEXURE A-4.

8. Since you have deliberately and intentionally violated the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, therefore this show cause notice is being served upon you as to why the contempt of court proceedings should not be filed against you before Hon'ble Supreme Court and you be punished as per law.

If you fail to respond within 15 days from the date of service of this notice upon you, the Committee shall invoke appropriate remedy before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

By order of Committee-GFIL

B.M. Bedi
District & Sessions Judge (Retd)
Member

Encl: As above

Reply of Sh. S. Ramaswamy, I.A.S. (Retd)

Date : 8.10.2021

To

Sh. B.M. Bedi, District & Sessions Judge (Retd)
Hon'ble Member, Committee-GFIL,
Sector 39-B, Chandigarh

Subject: Reply of Sh. S. Ramaswamy, I.A.S. (Retd), Chief Commissioner,
Uttarakhand, Right to Service Commission to your notice dated
20.7.2021 for Contempt of Court.

Sir,

Reply is as under:-

1. That the notice is against the law & facts and liable to be rejected prima facie.
2. That before Chief Commissioner, Uttarakhand, Right to Service Commission, the replier was working as the Chairman of Court of Revenue Board, Uttarakhand at Dehradun and was discharging the work assigned under the law and hearing & disposing of the cases and appeals/revisions related to Revenue Court in good faith.
3. That one Revision No. 88 of 2018 Smt. Reeta Aggrawal versus Tehsil Vikas Nagar, Dehradun was filed before me in which old Khasra No. 586 area 1.6190 hectare or 4 Acres was assigned new Khasra No. 1171 Kha, area 0.4250 hectare in village Jhajra,

Pargana Pachwadoon, Tehsil Vikas Nagar, District Dehradun under new bandobast 1400 fasli.

4. That only fact proved prima facie was that the land mentioned in the case belonged to Gram Sabah/State Government. Other portion of Khasra No. 1171 min belong to different Bhoomidhars who illegally sold land to Golden Forest but mistakenly the land belonged to Gram Sabah was also shown to be sold to Golden Forest and in the result became subject matter of Section 166/167 of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act though no question arises to be and whereas there is no relation of Golden Forest with Khasra No. 1171 Kha Area 0.4250 hectare.
5. That in this regard a joint Committee was constituted and in the investigation report (Annexure 1) by Revenue Inspector (Jhajra), Revenue Sub-Inspector (Jhajra), Naib Tehsildar (Revenue Board, Jhajra), Tehsildar (Vikas Nagar) mistake was discovered and submission was made to correct the same.
6. That on the basis of all the legal facts, I being supreme officer of Court of Revenue Board directed Collector, Dehradun to correct the mistake within two months vide my order dated 15th January, 2020 (Annexure 2).
7. That till that date Revenue Board was not aware of the order dated 14th January, 2020 and I was not given any information about the

filed against the same. Section 334 of UP Zamindari Act reads as under:-

Section 334

"Protection of action taken under this Act- (1) No officer or servant of the Government shall be liable in any civil or criminal proceeding in respect of any act done or purporting to be done under this Act or under any rules made thereunder, if the act was done in good faith in the course of execution of the duties or the discharge of functions, imposed by or under this Act.

(2) No Suit or other legal proceeding shall lie against the State Government for any damage caused or likely to be caused or any injury suffered by virtue of any provisions of this Act or by anything in good faith done or intended to be done in pursuance of this Act or any rules made thereunder.

12. That, I had already passed order dated 15th January, 2020 to correct the account of Golden Forest and directed Collector, Dehradun to correct the revenue record. I or the Revenue Board was not aware of order dated 14th January, 2020 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, I have not violated any law while passing the order dated 15th January, 2020.
13. That if Committee-GFIL has any objection against order dated 15th January, 2020, it can be challenged by filing application u/s 170 Ka

of Code of Revenue Court Rules before the Bench of Revenue Board or Full Bench of Revenue Court.

14. That Similarly, if Committee-GFIL having any objection against the order dated 19th March, 2020 vide which order dated 15th January, 2020 was got executed, it can be challenged before Bench or Full Bench of review Revenue Board, Uttarakhand u/s 171 Ka of Revenue Court manual.

15. That it is also clarified here that information regarding order dated 14th January, 2020 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court was provided in August, 2020 (Annexure 5) from State Government i.e. after eight months, there was no information before that either from any person me or to Revenue Board. Therefore, the orders dated 15th January, 2020 and 19th March, 2020 passed by me in good faith.

In view of the above, the notice dated 20th July, 2021 which was received by me on 29th July, 2021 would be justified to be withdrawn.

Thanks,

Yours Sincerely,

Sh. S. Ramaswamy (Retd)
Chief Commissioner,
Uttarakhand, Right to Service Commission,
Chalna Hills Post Office Kulhan, Sahastradhara Road
Dehradun-248013, Uttarakhand.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AT NEW DELHI
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 701 OF 2021

IN

T.C. (CIVIL) NO.2 OF 2004

IN THE MATTER OF

B.M. BEDI, MEMBER,
COMMITTEE – GFIL

... CONTEMPT PETITIONER

VERSUS

SHRI RAMJI SHARAN SHARMA
ADDITIONAL COLLECTOR (E),
DEHRADUN

... ALLEGED CONTEMNOR

ADDITIONAL AFFIDAVIT BY THE COMMITTEE – GFIL
(APPOINTED BY THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT)

I, Brij Mohan Bedi, S/o Shri Sadhu Ram Bedi, aged about 71 years,
R/o H. No. 22, Sector-4, Panchkula, Haryana, do hereby solemnly
affirm and state as under:-

1. That I am one of the members of the Committee appointed by the
Hon'ble Supreme Court on 19.8.2004 and reconstituted by the
Hon'ble High Court of Delhi on 20.12.2016 under directions of
Hon'ble Supreme Court. I am duly authorised and being fully
competent and fully conversant with the facts and circumstances
of the case, I am competent to swear this affidavit.

bedi

