

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4482 of 2014

IN

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 1664 of 2013

=====

Satish Kumar, son of Sri Ramkeshwar Singh, R/o- Village- Salempur, Dumra
B.M.P., Road-14, P.S.- Airport, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Anjani Kumar Singh, Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri P.K. Thakur, Director General of Police, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. Sri Jagal Choudhary, Superintendent of Police, Saran (Chhapra).
4. Sri Sunit Kumar, The Chairman, Constable Selection Board, B.M.P.- 14, Patna.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Verma, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Kundan Bahadur Singh, S.C.-22.
For C.S.B.C.	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Senior Advocate.
		Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate.
		Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.N. SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 11-02-2015

Mr. Pushkar Narayan Shahi, A.A.G. 10

appeared along with Sri Sunit Kumar, Chairman,
Central Selection Board of Constables, Patna and
states that Sri Kumar has perhaps been mistakenly
called by this Court as at the relevant time he was not
heading the Regional Board, which is said to have not
complied the order of the High Court dated 21.07.2009
passed in C.W.J.C. No. 8417 of 2009, Annexure-1.

It is stated that at the relevant time the Selection
Board was headed by Superintendent of Police,

Sitamarhi, who at the time of filing of the contempt petition was Commandant, B.M.P.-14.

2. In view of the submission made by A.A.G.-10, the Court asked the counsel for the petitioner, who expressed apology for wrongly impleading Sri Kumar as Opposite Party No. 4 in the instant contempt petition. Accordingly, the Court is also expressing regret for the inconvenience caused to Sri Kumar. Sri Kundan Bahadur Singh, learned Standing Counsel No. 22 states that the then Central Divisional Board No. 3 passed order dated 07.02.2010 in compliance of the order of this Court, copy whereof has been served on the petitioner. Petitioner, if aggrieved with the said order, may challenge the same.

3. The contempt petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

(V.N. Sinha, J)

P.K.P.

U		T	
---	--	---	--