

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4839 of 2013**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2635 of 2013**

=====

Baleshwar Prasad, S/O Late Ram Chandra Prasad, resident of village -  
Piprahi, P.S. Piprahi, District Sheohar.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Alok Kumar Sinha, Agriculture Produce Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
3. Rameshwar Singh, Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. D.S. Gangwar, Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms, Bihar, Patna.
5. M. Sarvanam, Director, Agriculture, Bihar, Patna.
6. B. Rajendra, Administrator, Bihar State Agriculture Marketing Board (Dissolved), Pant Bhawan, Baily Road, Patna.
7. Anirudh Prasad Singh, Director, Provident Fund Directorate of Provident Fund, Pant Bhawan, Baily Road, Patna.
8. Manish Kant Jha, District Provident Fund Officer, Muzaffarpur.
9. Shambhu Kumar, Sub Divisional Agriculture Officer (Extension), Nawadah.

.... .... Opp.Party /s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Radha Krishna Singh, Advocate.

For the Opp. Party/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Keshri, Advocate.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**

2    20-01-2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The direction of this Court dated 08.02.2013 in connected C.W.J.C. No. 2635 of 2013 was very limited. The Agriculture Production Commissioner was only directed to verify the claim of the working of the petitioner for the period of 02.09.2008 to 31.03.2012 and also to make legitimate payment for the working period found by him.

3. The opposite parties have filed a show cause reply

where it has been stated that the petitioner has been made such legitimate payment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner also accepts this fact that the petitioner has been paid an amount of Rs. 60,000/- approximately but not the whole amount and as such the opposite parties are liable for being proceeded and punished for a committing contempt.

5. The question however would be, if this Court itself had not quantified the amount and the petitioner has also not filed any rejoinder to the show cause reply, how this issue could be decided in contempt petition? If the petitioner has, therefore, any further grievance for remaining non-payment of claimed amount including grant of increment, the remedy for him cannot be by pursuing this contempt petition. He may however take any other recourse for redressal of the rest of his grievance arising out of the order passed by the Agriculture Produce Commissioner.

6. With the aforementioned observation and direction, this petition is disposed of.

**(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)**

Sujit/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|