

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1048 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1511 of 2012

=====

Mostt. Marachhi Devi Wife Of Late Nageshwar Ram Resident Of Village -
Mali, P.O. And P.S. Karpi, District : Arwal

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandary Department, Bihar, Patna, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna, Namely Sri Santosh Kumar Mal
2. The Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Government Of Bihar, Patna, Namely Sri Rameshwar Singh
3. The Director, Animal Husbandary Department, Bihar, Patna Vikash Bhawan, Patna, Namely Sri Rajesh Kumar
4. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna Birchand Patel Path Marg, Patna - 800001, Namely Sri Sanjay Kumar
5. The Director-Cum-Joint Commissioner, Directorate General Provident Fund, Pant Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna, Namely Sri Anirudh Prasad
6. The District Provident Fund Officer, Patna, Namely, Sri Brajesh
7. The Assistant Director, Cattle (D.V.) Large Cattle Development Project, Field Level, Bikram, Patna, Namely Sri Arjun Das
8. The Sub-Treasury Officer, Danapur, Patna, Namely Smt. Urmila Kumari

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dinbandhu Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 18-02-2015

Nobody appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Counsel for the Accountant General as well as the State
are present.

This application has been filed alleging wilful
disobedience/disregard of the order dated 23.01.2012 passed in
CWJC No. 1511 of 2012 operative potion whereof reads as

under:-

“Considering the delay involved in raising the grievance and there being no satisfactory explanation therefor, this Court is not persuaded to invoke its extraordinary and discretionary writ jurisdiction in the matter. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, contends that the petitioner would make appropriate representation in this regard before the concerned authority (respondent no.6).

The application stands disposed of with the liberty aforesaid.”

Counsel for the State points out that after disposal of the writ petition the petitioner again filed a writ petition vide CWJC No. 14230 of 2012 which was dismissed.

In my view, the present contempt application is entirely misconceived. It is accordingly dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--