

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.185 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10953 of 2014

=====

Mohan Lal, son of Late Ram Sigasan Lal, Resident of village - Dhuraki,
P.S. Dinara, District - Rohtas at present residing at near Gandhi Memorial
College, Kochas, P.S. Kochas, District - Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sri Anjani Kumar Singh, the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar,
Patna.
3. Sri Animesh Kumar Parasar, the District Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. Sri Santosh Kumar, the Circle Officer, Kochas, P.S. Kochas, District -
Rohtas at Sasaram.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ras Bihari Thakur, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Ms. Shilpa Singh, GA-12

Mr. Ranjan Kumar, AC to GA-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL ORDER

2 31-08-2016 Heard Mr. Ras Bihari Thakur, learned counsel

appearing for the petitioner and Ms. Shilpa Singh, learned

Government Advocate No.12 for the State.

Although this application has been filed for initiation
of contempt against the opposite parties for non-compliance of
the order passed in CWJC No.10953 of 2014, a copy of which is
placed at Annexure-1 whereby this Court while issuing direction
to the Collector, Rohtas as well as the Circle Officer, Kochas,
District- Rohtas to stop any proposed construction, has also
issued direction that in case any construction is made over the
land of the petitioner, it should be removed forthwith. This

application is filed complaining that although the opposite parties have not proceeded with any construction but the construction made in the meanwhile have not been removed and thus contempt has been committed by them.

Learned counsel for the State has submitted that there is no such pleading in the writ petition or in the contempt application regarding any construction made by the State and thus there is no issue of removal of any construction. Annexure-2 is the representation of the petitioner which again does not discuss any construction standing on the land of the petitioner allegedly made by the State which requires removal.

In the circumstance, no cause for indulgence is made out. This contempt application is disposed of accordingly.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--