

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4573 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1002 of 2011

=====

1. Sangita Devi @ Sangita wife of Late Shivrath Rai, resident of Village- Nirpur Chandmari, Danapur , Police Station- Sahpur, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Mr. Afzal Imam, The Chairman Nagar Nigam, Patna.
2. Mr. Ajay Kumar, The Executive Officer, Patna City Municipality.
3. Sitaram Rai, son of Late Thana Rai
4. Dilip Rai, son of Late Shivrath Rai. Both residents of Village- Nirpur Chandmari, Danapur, Police Station - Shahpur, Post - Chandmari, District- Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Juhi Kumari

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Keshri

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 01-07-2015 Heard the Counsel for the petitioner and the Counsel
for the Patna Municipal Corporation.

A show cause has been filed on behalf of O.P. No. 2 enclosing therewith the order dated 17.06.2015 passed by the Municipal Commissioner of the Corporation rejecting the claim of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds.

The writ petition was disposed of vide Annexure-1 directing the petitioner to file a representation ventilating her grievance which was directed to be considered/examined in accordance with law within three months.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is delay in consideration of the matter by the opposite parties.

Counsel for the Corporation has drawn attention of the Court to the averments made in paragraph 7 of the show cause wherefrom it appears that several matters of identical nature remained pending with the Corporation on account of non-furnishment of the roaster by the Government. Efforts were made and after obtaining the roaster, the Establishment Committee considered the case of the petitioner and others wherein she was not found suitable.

This Court is satisfied from the statements made in the show cause that delay was not willful/deliberate. The opposite party has also sought apology therefor.

Counsel for the petitioner, however, tried to dispute the correctness of the order. In my view, such submission cannot be entertained in the contempt jurisdiction.

The contempt application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Pankaj/-

U			
---	--	--	--