

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.870 of 2015

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3568 of 2009

=====

1. Rajendra Prasad Singh, son of Late Julumdhari Singh, resident of Mohalla-Professor Colony, Station Road, Indai, District-Sheikhpura.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur through its Registrar, namely Md. Gulam Mustafa.
2. The Vice-Chancellor, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, Namely Dr. Rama Shankar Dubey.
3. The Registrar, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, namely Md. Gulam Mustafa.
4. The Finance Officer, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, namely Mr. Birendra Prasad
5. The Principal, Ramadhin College, Sheikhpura, namely Dr. Ramakant Singh.

.... Contemnors/Opp.Parties.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pramod Kumar

For the Opp.parties : Mr. Rajendra kumar Giri

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 16-09-2015

Heard the counsel for the petitioner and the respondent

Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University (for short 'the University').

The application alleges wilful/deliberate disregard/disobedience of the order dated 16.1.2012 passed in CWJC No. 3568 of 2009. Noticing the fact that some of the retiral dues was/were not paid to the petitioner, this Court disposed of the writ petition permitting him to file a representation before the Registrar of the University who was commanded to examine and dispose of the same by a reasoned order . In case the order to be passed by the

respondent admits any claim the same should also be directed to be paid.

In the show cause filed on behalf of the opposite party nos. 1 to 5 a reasoned order dated 26.4.2015 (Annexure-A) passed by the Registrar of the University (opposite party no.3) has been enclosed. On perusal wherefrom it appears the Registrar has passed a reasoned order denying some of the entitlement of the petitioner. However, it appears from the impugned order that those dues which are admitted have been authorized/sanctioned in favour of the petitioner. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that some of the dues of the petitioner remained to be paid. If that be so, then the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the concerned authority for the authorization of the remaining dues, if any. Considering the order which this Court passed on the writ petition and the statements made in the show cause as also the order which the Registrar passed on 26.4.2015, I am satisfied that the order has been substantially complied with.

The contempt application is dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Shyam/-

U			
---	--	--	--