

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2155 of 2014

In
LPA 754 of 2013

- =====
1. Sanjeev Kumar Jha @ Sanjeev Kumar Ojha, Son of Ram Narain Jha, resident of village- Haria, P.S. Bounsi, District- Banka
 2. Phanider Nath Pathak, Son of Moti Pathak, resident of village- Panda Tola (opposite side of Rail Line), P.S. Bounsi, District- Banka

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The Union of India through Secretary, Department of Railway, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
2. Mr. R. R. Prasad, son of not known to the petitioner, The Secretary, Department of Railway, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
3. Mr. R. K. Gupta, son of not known to the petitioner, The General Manager, Eastern Railway - 17, Netaji Subhash Road, Have Street, Calcutta (W.B.)
4. Mr. P.N. Ram, son of not known to the petitioner, The Chief Administrative Officer (Construction), Eastern Railway, 17, Have Street, Calcutta (W.B.)
5. Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, son of not known to the petitioner, The Deputy General Manager, Eastern Railway, 17, Have Street, Calcutta (W.B.)
6. Mr. Rajesh Agral, son of not known to the petitioner, The Divisional Railway Manager, Eastern Railway, Malda (W.B.)
7. Mr. S. S. Priyadarshi, son of not known to the petitioner, The Deputy Chief Engineer (Construction), Eastern Railway, Bhagalpur
8. The State of Bihar
9. Mr. Saket Kumar, son of not known to the petitioner, The District Magistrate, Banka
10. Mr. Ram Shankar, son of not known to the petitioner, The District Land Acquisition Officer, Banka

.... Opp. Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Balram Kapri, Advocate
For the Railways : Mr. Anil Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vikash Kumar, AC to PAAG

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA)

2 26-06-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned

counsels for the Railways and for the State.

It is accepted by learned counsel for the petitioners that during the pendency of the contempt application the order under contempt has been complied with and both the petitioners have been provided job in terms of the direction given in the order under contempt. The petitioner No.2 has certain grievances in the matter but they do not pertain to the order under contempt and for the same he may take recourse to appropriate remedies.

The contempt application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

(Anjana Mishra, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--