

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.6422 of 2013

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 21267 of 2012

- =====
1. Kapildeo Prasad Singh S/O Sri Kripal Singh Resident of Village and P.O Majhau, P.S- Manjhaul, District- Begusarai.
 2. Pramod Kumar No. 1 S/O Late Singheshwar Prasad Singh Resident Of Mohalla- Brahmpura, P.S- Brahmpura, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Ashok Kumar Singh, Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Shri Anshuli Arya, S/O not known presently posted as the Principal Secretary, Public Health and Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Bishweshwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. Sri A.K. Dwivedi S/O not known presently posted as the Joint Secretary, Public Health and Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Bishweshwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. Sri Surendra Kumar S/O not known presently posted as the Chief Engineer (Mechanical), Public Health and Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Bishweshwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. Sri Shivalal Ram S/O not known presently posted as the Superintending Engineer, Public Health and Engineering Department, Public Health Engineering Circle, Motihari.
6. Sri Rajdeo Singh S/O not known presently posted as the Executive Engineer, Public Health and Engineering Department, Public Health Mechanical Division, Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate.

For the O.P/s : Md. Anis Akhtar, AC to GA-1.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 14-05-2015 This case has been brought under the heading "To Be Mentioned" at the instance of the learned counsel for the State pointing out that the order dated 08.05.2015 has been wrongly recorded inasmuch as the contempt application was disposed of in view of Annexure-A to the show cause reply of the opposite party showing full compliance of the direction given by this Court in the

connected writ application.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not oppose to such objection of the learned counsel for the State.

3. This Court would also, on verifying this aspect from the records, find that a wrong order has been inadvertently recorded, signed and pronounced on 08.05.2015 inasmuch as the order dictated on that day as found in the stenographer's notebook reads as follows:

"Having regard to the fact that the order of this Court has already been complied and the petitioner has already been paid the amount, as per the direction of this Court, vide Annexure-A to the show cause reply, this application now has become infructuous and it is, accordingly, disposed of. "

4. Thus, it appears that a typographical error has been committed in the order dated 08.05.2015, which accordingly is directed to be recalled and is substituted by the following order:

"Having regard to the fact that the order of this Court has already been complied and the petitioner has already been paid the amount, as per the direction of this Court, vide Annexure-A to the show cause reply, this application now has become infructuous and it is, accordingly, disposed of. "

Sujit/-

(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)

U			
---	--	--	--