

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2294 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13362 of 2014

=====

Rajesh Tiwary, son of Sri Manohar Tiwary, Resident of Village-Mangara,
P.S.- Karakat (Gorari), District-Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Mr. Animesh Kumar Parasar, the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.
3. Mr. Rajesh Kumar, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bikramganj, District-Rohtas.
4. Mr. Anuj Prasad, the Anchal Adhikari Karakat, District-Rohtas.
5. Parasnath Singh (Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat, Chiksil), son of Late Motichand Singh, Resident of Village-Hariharpur, P.S.-Karakat, District-rohtas.
6. Krishnakant singh (Rojgar Sewak, Gram Panchayat, Chiksil), son of Ram Tawakya Singh, Resident of village-Bardiham, P.S.- Karakat (Gorari), District-Rohtas.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh
Mr. Sudama Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manish Kumar, GP-8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 19-10-2016 Mr. Sudama Singh, learned advocate appears for

the petitioner, while the opposite parties are represented by Mr.

Lalit Kishore, PAAG-1 and Mr. Vivek Prasad, learned G.P.-7.

Pursuant to the order of this Court Mr. Animesh
Parasar, District Magistrate, Rohtas is present along with the
show cause enclosing the copy of the order dated 14.10.2016
whereby the grievance raised by the petitioner in the light of the
order passed in CWJC No.13362 of 2014 has been disposed of.
He tenders apology for the delay.

Although Mr. Sudama Singh, learned counsel for



the petitioner submits that the order passed in not in tune with the directions of this Court passed on the writ petition but such scrutiny of the order passed can only be done in a properly constituted proceedings and not in the contempt jurisdiction. That the order passed by this Court requiring the District Magistrate, Rohtas to dispose of the grievance of the petitioner, has since been complied by the District Magistrate who has since disposed of the representation vide order passed on 14.10.2016, a copy of which is enclosed at Annexure-K to the show cause filed on behalf of the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram today, I am not persuaded to continue with the contempt proceedings which is accordingly disposed of.

The petitioner, if so aggrieved, by the order passed by the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram disposing of his claim, shall be at liberty to question the same before an appropriate forum by filing an appropriate application.

The rule issued against the District Magistrate, Rohtas vide order passed on 5.10.2016 stands discharged.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

deepika/-

U			
---	--	--	--