

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4832 of 2013

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 7340 of 2012

=====

Veena Kumari W/O Hare Krishna Resident Of Jhauakothi, Khanjarpur, P.S. Barari,
District Bhagalpur, Presently Residing At, C/O Shri Shiv Kumar Prasad, Muhalla
East Lohanipur, P.O. S. Kadam Kuan, District Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Mr. A.K. Sinha, The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Dr. S. Siddharth, The Principle Secretary, Urban Development And Housing Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Anupam Kr. Suman, The Managing Director, The Bihar State Housing Board, 6, Mangles Road, Patna.
4. Mr. Minhaj Alam, The Commissioner-Cum-Chairman, Divisional Allotment Committee, Bhagalpur Division, Bihar State Housing Board, Bhagalpur.
5. Mr. Santosh Kr. Mali, The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
6. Mr. Saurabh Kant, The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Housing Board, Bhagalpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dr. Kislay
For the Bihar State Housing Board	:	Mr. Anshuman Singh, Mr. Siddharth Shankar Pandey
For the State	:	Mr. Gayan Prakash Ojha, G.P.22 Mr. Praveen Kumar, AC to G.P. 22.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-02-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Housing Board
and learned counsel for the State.

This contempt application is filed for non-compliance
of order dated 04.02.2013 passed in C.W.J.C. No.7340 of 2012
whereby the petitioner was permitted to withdraw the writ

application with liberty to raise the grievance before opposite party no.4 with a copy to respondent no.3. In case, such representation is filed within a period of three weeks stating the relevant details as also with the copy of the relevant document, the same shall be disposed of preferably within three months.

Learned counsel for the opposite party nos. 3, 4 and 6, Urban Development and Housing Development, Government of Bihar submits that in the light of the order under contempt, the petitioner has filed representation dated 19.02.2013, which has been disposed of on 19.11.2014 and the copy of the same has already been communicated to the petitioner vide Memo No. 8557 dated 19.11.2014. Hence, the representation has been decided in accordance with law.

In view of the above submission, since the representation of the petitioner has already been disposed of, as detailed in paragraph no.6 of the show cause filed on behalf of opposite party, the contempt application is disposed of.

However, if petitioner feels aggrieved with the order, he would be at liberty to avail appropriate remedy.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Shail/-

U			
---	--	--	--