

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4554 of 2013

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11196 of 2012

=====

1. Most. Kalawati Devi, w/o Late Kuber Nath Singh,
2. Suman Kumar Singh, son of Late Kuber Nath Singh
3. Vishal Kumar Singh, son of Late Kuber Nath Singh
4. Vikash Kumar Singh, son of Late Kuber Nath Singh, All resident of
Village - Kulharia P.O.- Kulharia, P.S.- Koilwar, District - Bhojpur at Ara.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sri Afzal Amanullah, the Principal Secretary, Water Resources
Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Shree Satish Kumar Karn, the Superintending Engineer, Irrigation
Mechanic Circle, Birpur District -Supaul
4. Shree Surendra Mishra, the Executive Engineer, Irrigation (Mechanic)
Division, Birpur, District -Purnea
5. Shree Shashil Kumar, the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Mechanic
Division, Birpur, District -Supaul
6. Shree Shashi Bhushan Kumar, the District Magistrate, Supaul
7. Shree Sanjay Kumar, the Accountant General, Bihar, Patna
8. Shree Jitan Kumar Manjan, the District Provident Fund Officer, Supaul
9. Shree Birendra Kumar, the District Provident Fund Officer, Purnea
10. Shree Mirtunjay Lal Das, the District Treasury Officer, Supaul

.... Opp. Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binit Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Durgesh Nandan, AAG 14
For Accountant General : Mr. P.K.Rajgrihar, Standing Counsel

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA
ORAL ORDER

10 25-11-2016 A supplementary show cause is filed on behalf of
opposite party No.2, the Principal Secretary, Water Resources
Department, Government of Bihar in which it is stated that the
order under contempt has been fully complied with by passing a
further order dated 11.11.2016 in continuation of the order dated
8.3.2013 passed by then Principal Secretary.

On a consideration of the aforesaid facts, it is evident that
the order under contempt has been complied with.



Learned counsel for the petitioners makes a grievance that all the documents had already been produced before the Department by the deceased husband of petitioner No.1, whereas the order dated 11.11.2016 states that if the applicant produces the evidence regarding the deposit of Government contribution in the provident fund then the claim shall be considered in accordance with the Rules.

This Court in its contempt jurisdiction shall not go into such aspect of the matter and it is open to the petitioners either to produce fresh evidence before the Department or produce evidence showing that the same had already been deposited.

The contempt application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--

