

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1679 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8315 of 2003

- =====
1. Leela Shankar, widow of Late Dr. Uday Shankar Bhagat, 03-145, Block-2, Normanton Park, Singapore 118999
 2. Mrs. Mamta Mishra, 105, Deo Lok Apartment, Road No. 3E, New Patliputra Colony, Patna 800013
 3. Dewa Kant Mishra, 105, Deo Lok Apartment, Road No. 3E, New Patliputra Colony, Patna 800013

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mr. Brajesh Mehrotra, Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Mr. Shekhar Chandra Verma, Joint Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. Post Vacant, Addl. Secretary-Cum-Enquiry Officer, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
5. Mr. Anil Kumar, Deputy Secretary, Health Department Government of Bihar, Patna
6. Dr. R.D. Ranjan, Director-in-Chief, Health Services, Bihar, Patna
7. Dr. Jagdish Singh, Dy. Director, (Administration), Health Services, Bihar, Patna
8. Dr. Rameshwar Lathi, Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Darbhanga
9. Mr. R.K. Khandelwal, Divisional Commissioner, Darbhanga
10. Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Accountant General, Bihar, Beer Chand Patel Path, Patna
11. Mr. Om Prakash, Senior Accounts Officer, A.G. Office, Beer Chand Patel Path, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Saptashwa Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sunil Kumar, A.C. to S.C.-II
For the Accountant General : Mr. K.P. Gupta, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

7 20-07-2016

This application has been filed seeking initiation of contempt proceeding against the opposite parties for deliberate violation of this Court's order dated 11.11.2014 passed in

C.W.J.C. No. 8315 of 2003, operative portion of which reads thus:-

“All the pensionary benefits which the substituted petitioners would be entitled to consequent upon the quashing of the impugned orders should be paid to the substituted petitioners within a period of three months from today, failing which it shall earn interest at the rate of 12% per annum from the date the petitioner had become entitled to receive such amount till the date of actual payment.”

A show cause reply has been filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 from which it transpires that this Court's order has been substantially complied with and no case of deliberate disobedience of this Court's order dated 11.11.2014, is made out.

Petitioner has submitted that the opposite parties have not supplied to the petitioner the details of calculations since various heads of the dues which are said to have been made to the petitioner so as to enable the petitioner to ascertain whether the dues have been calculated and entire amount has been paid to the petitioner.

Considering the facts and circumstances, the present contempt proceeding stands dropped with an observation that the calculation with respect to payments made to the petitioner be supplied to the petitioner within a period of two months from the

date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. It is also observed that such calculation must be clear referring to different heads.

This application stands disposed of, accordingly.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

kundan/-

U			
---	--	--	--