

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2490 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 9521 of 2012

=====

Nand Kishhore Prasad S/o Late Ragho Mahto Resident of Village and Post
Office Poroha, P.S. Manpur, District Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Arun Kumar Singh, Principal Secretary,
Water Resources Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Sichai Bhawan, Patna.
2. Mr. Arvind Singh the Director Provident Fund Pant Bhawan, Patna.
3. Sri Rajesh Pd. Yadav, the District Provident Fund Officer, Ara.
4. Sri Ragho Singh, the Executive Engineer Sone Canal Division, Ara.
5. Sri Satendra Paswan, the Treasury Officer, Nalanda, Biharsharif.
6. Sri Sanjay Kumar, the Accountant General, Bihar, Birchard Patel Marg,
Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Kishore Prasad
Mr. Vishwanath Prasad
For the State Mr. Rajesh Kumar, A.C. to G.P.10
For the Accountant General Mr. Ranjan Kumar, S.C.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 20-05-2015 Heard the parties.

The writ application was disposed of on 14.05.2012

operative portion/part whereof reads as under:-

“Let the petitioner file a fresh representation raising the aforesaid grievance detailing the relevant facts in his possession together with a copy of the present order before the Executive Engineer, Sone Canal, Division Ara (respondent no.4) and the District Provident Fund Officer , Ara (respondent no.3) within 05 weeks whereafter those two respondents, acting in



tandem, will examine the said grievance of the petitioner and redress the same in accordance with law within 08 weeks from the date of filing/presentation. Needless to observe that while taking steps in the light of the present order those respondents will keep in focus the relevant Rule/provision which would entitle the petitioner to statutory interest.”

In the show cause filed on behalf of opposite party no.4 it has been stated that the claim of the petitioner for payment of GPF dues was examined and authority slip vide letter no. 1013 dated 19.10.2012 for Rs. 3,72,194/- for final withdrawal thereof has already been issued. Copy of the same has been enclosed as Annexure-A.

Counsel for the petitioner disputes the amount which has been sanctioned.

In my view, such dispute regarding the admissibility of the amount in the light of the order passed on the writ petition can not be considered in a contempt proceeding. Having regard to the statements made in the show cause and the order which this Court passed, I am satisfied that the order passed on the writ petition has substantially been complied with. The contempt application is accordingly dismissed.

Dismissal of this application shall, however, not prevent the petitioner from raising a dispute about correctness of the amount being sanctioned in favour of the petitioner under the head GPG in accordance with law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--