

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.215 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 7080 of 2015

=====

Satish Kumar Son of Late Hari Nandan Singh Resident of Village -
Surhatha, P.O. + P.S. Bibipur, via - Anirudh Belsar, District - Vaishali at
Hazipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Dr. Dharmendra Singh Gangwar The State of Bihar through its Principal
Secretary Higher Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Dr. A.K.P. Singh, Vice-Chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University,
Bihar, Pusa at Samastipur, District - Samastipur.
3. Dr. K.M. Singh, the Director, Extension Education Rajendra Agriculture
University, Bihar, Pusa (Samastipur), District - Samastipur.
4. Dr. Jitendra Kumar, The Programme Co-Ordinator, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra, Saraiya, Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur.
5. Dr. Sudhir Das, The Programme Co-Ordinator, Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Madhopur, District - West Champaran at Bettiah.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Tiwary

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

8 21-09-2016 Heard Sri Anil Kumar Tiwary, learned counsel for the

petitioner, learned AC to GP No. 5 as well as Sri Arvind Ujjwal,

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the officials of the

Rajendra Agriculture University.

The present petition was filed with a prayer to initiate

contempt proceeding against opposite parties on an allegation of

willful disobedience to an order dated 5/10/2015 passed in CWJC

No. 7080 of 2015 . By the said order the writ petition which was

filed by the petitioner for his arrear salary was disposed of

granting liberty to the petitioner to file fresh representation and thereafter the respondent /Vice Chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University was directed to examine the same and pass appropriate order .

In this case a show cause was filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 3 and in paragraph no. 3 and 4 of the show cause a specific stand has been taken regarding compliance of the order by way of payment of dues.

In this case a rejoinder has been filed by the petitioner and dispute is being raised that payment has not been made as claimed by the petitioner.

Keeping in view the fact in the writ petition there was no specific direction to pay exactly what amount, direction was to consider the representation and thereafter in compliance with the order the payment has already been made, the court is of the opinion that it cannot be a case for initiating contempt proceeding. If the petitioner feels aggrieved with the action of the opposite parties, he would be at liberty to avail appropriate remedy.

The contempt petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U			
---	--	--	--