

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4136 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1859 of 2014

=====

1. Sheikh Mohammad Qasim Son of Late Sheikh Abdul Qayum Resident of Mohalla- Rukunpura, Bailey Road, Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Urban Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Dr. S. Siddhartha.
2. The Patna Municipal Corporation, through its Municipal Commissioner, Patna Municipal Corporation, Maurya Lok, Patna namely Sri Kuldeep Narayan.
3. Sri Kuldeep Narayan, Municipal Commissioner, Patna Municipal Corporation, Maurya Lok, Patna.
4. Sri Hari Shankar Prasad Kushwaha, the Vigilance Officer, Patna Municipal Corporation, Patna.
5. Sri Manoj Kumar, the Executive Officer, Phulwari Nagar Parishad, Phulwari, Patna.
6. Ali Asdar Son of Late Ali Yusuf Director of M/S Realtors Pvt. Ltd. having its office at Samiriddhi Commercial Centre, 3rd Floor, S.P. Verma Road, Patna-800001.

.... Respondents-Opp.Parties.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 02-09-2015 Heard Mr. Bindhya Keshri Kumar Sr. Advocate for

the petitioner and Mr. Anil Kumar who has appeared on behalf of

the Executive Officer, Phulwari Nagar Parishad, Phulwari, Patna.

A show cause on behalf of the opposite party no.5
has been filed.

The writ application raises a grievance that the
observation of this Court made in the order dated 18.04.2014 in
CWJC No. 1859 of 2014(Annexure-1) has not till date been
complied with by the opposite party. The writ application was

disposed of in the following terms:-

“Having heard the parties, the writ application is disposed of directing the petitioner to ventilate his grievance before the Competent Authority i.e. the Executive Officer of the Phulwarisharif Nagar Parishad. Needless to observe that if any such application is filed, the Executive Officer of the Phulwarisharif Nagar Parishad (respondent no.5) shall consider the said grievance application of the petitioner and take appropriate steps/action as required in law expeditiously.”

In the show cause the opposite party has explained the circumstances under which the decision could not be taken.

However in para 5, it has been stated as under:-

“5. That it is stated and submitted that opposite party no.5 seeks further more time in order to proper investigate the matter of present for free fair and proper compliance of the order dated 18.04.2015 in accordance with law.”

The counsel for the opposite party states that within one month the matter concerning the petitioner pending before the Executive Officer (O.P. No.5) shall be disposed of in accordance with law.

Noticing the aforesaid statements made in the show cause, the contempt application is disposed of.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Shyam/-

U			
---	--	--	--