

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1282 of 2014

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11457 of 2009

=====

Dilip Kumar Verma Son Of Late Sadho Prasad Verma, Resident Of Mohalla -N Ranighat Mahendru, Patna - 6, P.S. - Sultanjganj, District And Town - Patna At Prsent Associate Professor, Department Of Physics, Ganga Devi Mahilla College, Kankarbagh, Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Sri Amarjeet Sinha, The Commissioner - Cum-Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt, Of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri E. Srinivasan, The Joint Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt, Of Bihar, Patna.
3. Magadh University Through Dr. K. Yadav, Registrar, Bodh Gaya.
4. Sri Md. Istyak Ahmad, The Vice Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
5. Dr. K. Yadav., Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
6. Sri .D.K. Sinha, Finance Officer, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya,
7. Sri Manoj Kumar, The Lie Sensing Officer-Cum Branch Head Branch Office, Patna.
8. Dr. Usha Sinha, The Principal Of Ganga Devi Mahila College, Kankarbagh, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Verma, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Binita Singh, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

4 15-09-2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Having regard to the very limited nature of direction given in the order of this Court dated 10.05.2012 passed in connected writ application being C.W.J.C No. 11457 of 2009, directing the Opposite Parties to make payment of admitted amount of arrears of salary of the petitioner, this Court will have no difficulty in understanding that if the



Opposite Parties have made payment of such arrears of salary at least up to the date of filing of this contempt application, there would be now no question of initiating proceeding of contempt specially when neither the amount was quantified by this Court nor even direction was given in any manner . The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that the Opposite Parties ought to have made further payment of arrears to the petitioner at least to the date of order of this Court, has to be only noted for its being rejected. There was never any direction by this Court and the Opposite Parties will not be held guilty after filing of the show cause reply that the direction given by this Court has been complied.

That being so, this contempt application has become infructuous and is, accordingly, disposed of as having become infructuous.

Nothing said in this order, however, will come in the way of the petitioner in claiming other admissible amount in accordance with law.

(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)

Ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--