

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.5560 of 2012

=====

Ram Bihari Jha S/O Late Yogeshwar Jha R/O Vill-Kalwara, P.S.-Rosera,
Distt-Samastipur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna Afzal Amanullah
2. Afzal Amanullah, The Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
3. Kamla Kant, the Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Gaya
4. Bhuneshwar Sahay, The Superintending Engineer, Water Wage Circle, Water Resources Department , Ghosi, Jehanabad
5. Chandra Gupta Prasad Yadav, District Provident Fund Officer, Aurangabad
6. Bishwa Mohan Chaudhary District Provident Fund Officer, Jehanabad
7. The Accountant General (A & E) Bihar

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hemant Kumar Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajeev Kr. Singh GP-15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

7 28-01-2015 Heard Mr. Jha for the petitioner, Mr. Rajgrihar for the

Accountant General and the State.

Mr. Jha draws attention of the Court to the order dated
14.01.2015 whereunder this Court had commanded the opposite
party to produce relevant authorization order(s).

Mr. Rajgrihar produces a communication dated
15.10.2014 authorizing arrears of pension in favour of the
petitioner in the sum of Rs. 7, 40,841. He also produces the
authorization letter contained in memo no. 02-2065-66 dated

13.03.2014 authorizing gratuity amount in favour of the petitioner.

These communications have been addressed to the Senior Treasury Officer, Rosera (Samastipur). This Court directs Mr. Rajgrihar to supply copies of the communications to Mr. Jha.

On a consideration of the aforesaid facts and looking to the diverse orders passed on the present contempt application particularly the order dated 14.01.2015 this Court is satisfied that the order of this Court has been substantially complied with. The present contempt application therefore merits to be dismissed. It is accordingly dismissed.

The petitioner, however, would be entitled to raise a grievance if part/portion of the post retiral dues is/are detected not paid before the appropriate/competent authority for consideration and disposal.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--