

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1030 of 2014

In

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 1961 of 2012

=====

Jagdish Mishra S/O Late Bidyut Kant Mishra, Resident Of Mohalla- Udyan
Nagar, Near 33 Mig, Kankarbagh Colony, Patna- 800 020, Bihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sri Sudhir Kumar, Secretary, Sugar Cane Development, Government Of Bihar, Patna
3. Sri Chittaranjan Singh, Managing Director, Bihar State Sugar Corporation, Bihar, Patna
4. Dr. A.K. Singh, Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-I, Employees Provident Fund Organization, Ministry Of Labour, Government Of India, Regional Office, Bhavishyanidhi Bhawan, R'Block, Road No.-6, Patna-800 001
5. The Branch Manager, Life Insurance Corporation Of India, Maurya Lok Complex, Bihar, Patna- 800 001.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	: Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh
	Mr. Krishna Chandra
For o.p. no. 4	Mr. Prashant Sinha
For o.p. no.3	Mr. Gyan Shankar
For o.p. nos. 1 & 2	Mr. Rakesh Ambastha, A.C. to AAG 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2015 Heard the parties.

Show causes have been filed on behalf of the concerned opposite parties.

The application seeks initiation of contempt proceeding for wilful/deliberate disregard/violation of the order dated 18.02.2013 passed in MJC No. 1961 of 2012 (Annexure-5) which arose out of the order dated 11.05.2011 passed in CWJC No. 17718 of 2009 (Annexure-1). From perusal of annexure-5 it appears that this Court on a consideration of diverse show causes

filed on behalf of the opposite parties found that the order passed on the writ petition was substantially complied with. However, it was observed that if the petitioner disputes payment of E.P.F. amount he may raise a grievance in this regard before the concerned authority. From the order dated 24.06.2014 (Annexure-A to the show cause filed on behalf of opposite party nos. 1 to 3) as also the order dated 05.09.2014 (Annexure-A to the show cause filed on behalf of opposite party no.4) it appears that the representation of the petitioner has been considered and disposed of. The petitioner in fact challenges the correctness of those orders.

In my view, the correctness or otherwise of those orders cannot be looked into in the contempt proceeding. If the petitioner is dissatisfied with the adjudications made under those orders, he may seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

The contempt application does not require further persuasion. It is dropped.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--