

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.164 of 2014

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12692 of 2012

=====

DR. SATYA DEO PANDEY, S/O JAGDISH PANDEY, RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE- HAZISARAI, P.S. KAKO, DIST- JEHANABAD.

.... PETITIONER/S

VERSUS

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR THROUGH SRI AMARJEET SINHA, THE
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY, PRIMARY
AND ADULT EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF BIHAR, PATNA
2. SRI RAM BUJHAWAN CHOUDHARY, DIRECTOR, SECONDARY
EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF BIHAR, PATNA
3. SRI MEDHO DAS, THE REGIONAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
EDUCATION, MAGADH DIVISION, GAYA

.... OPPOSITE PARTY/S

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. JAI PRAKASH VERMA

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.D. SANJAY

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-02-2015

Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.C. to

G.A. 9 appearing on behalf of the State are present.

The present contempt application has been filed for
noncompliance of the order dated 23.07.2012 passed in C.W.J.C.

No. 12692 of 2012 whereunder the aforesaid writ application was



allowed with observation that since the respondents already have all materials available with them, the explanation furnished by the petitioner and the comments of the District Education Officer, Gaya dated 29.01.2012, let a fresh reasoned and speaking order be passed in the manner discussed in the present order within a maximum period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order before respondent no.3.

Learned A.C. to G.P. 9 submits that in compliance of the order under contempt, the Regional Deputy Director of Education, Magadh Division, Gaya (opposite party no. 3) has passed order on 30.05.2014 refusing the claim of the petitioner, which would appear from paragraph 6 of the show cause field on behalf of the opposite party no. 3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order refusing the claim of the petitioner has been passed by the opposite party no. 3 beyond the time as fixed in the order under contempt, moreover, the order passed by the opposite party no. 3 refusing the claim of the petitioner is illegal.

Since the order, under contempt, has been complied with by the opposite party no.3, therefore, no further action is required. If the petitioner feels any grievance, he may take

recourse in accordance with law before the appropriate forum.
Accordingly, this contempt application is disposed of.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Bhardwaj/-

U			
---	--	--	--