

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2625 of 2013

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1930 of 2012

Barun Kumar Bhattacharya, Son of Late Narayan Chandra Bhattacharya,
Resident of Dakhin Darwaza, P.S. Civil Line, Gaya at present working as
Library Assistant in Nitya Nand Sanskrit College, Amarut Gaya, District
Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, Darbhanga District, Darbhanga through its Registrar Sri Sudhir Kumar Chaudhary.
2. Dr. Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, District Darbhanga.
3. Sri Ram Prapanna Sharma, Vice Chancellor, Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, District Darbhanga.
4. Sri Sudhir Kumar Chaudhary, Registrar, Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, District Darbhanga.
5. The State of Bihar through Sri Ajit Kumar Sinha, Principal Secretary, Department of erstwhile Human Resources Development, Resent Education Department, Vikas Bhawan, Patna.

.... Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Durga Nand Jha, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

7 28-04-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned counsel for the State.

In this case, this Court vide order dated 31.01.2012, passed in CWJC No. 1930 of 2012 had directed to consider the case of the petitioner within the parameter laid down in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi (3) reported in 2006(2)PLJR363 (SC) and State of Karnataka Vs. M.L. Kesari reported in 2010 (9) Supreme Court

Cases 247 = AIR 2010 Supreme Court 2587 and pass a reasoned order. In pursuance thereof the Vice-Chancellor, Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, Kameshwar Nagar, Darbhanga vide order dated 24.10.2013 has considered the case of the petitioner and passed the order not in favour of the petitioner assigning reasons in the order. In contempt proceedings, I am not required to give any opinion on its merit but the petitioner has liberty, if so advised, to move appropriate forum and to take suitable steps for redressal of his grievance.

In such view of the matter, this court thinks that there is no need to proceed in the contempt. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J.)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--