

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.915 of 2015

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 6121 of 2014

=====

Shiv Shankar son of Late Mohit Narayan Verma, Resident of village- Parsa,
P.S.- Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Mr. Vinay Kumar, the Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. Mr. Dharmdev Choudhary, the Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Mr. Nirmal Kumar, the Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle, Bettiah
4. Mr. Ashok Kumar Gupta, the Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Bettiah
5. Mr. Ram Ratan Ram, the Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Udakishanganj

.... Opp. Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Bhanu Rai
For the Opp. Party/s : Mr. Manish Kumar, GP-8
Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, A.C to G.P. 8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 30-03-2016 In compliance of the order dated 24.02.2016, Mr. Kamlesh Choudhary, Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, successor of Mr. Dharmdev Choudhary, Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna (Opposite Party No.2,) Mr. Nirmal Kumar, the Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle, Bettiah (Opposite Party no. 3) Mr. Bimal Kumar, presently posted as Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Bettiah, successor of original Opposite Party no.4, and Mr. Ram Ratan Ram, Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Udakishanganj (Opposite party no. 5) are in appearance in person

and two separate sets of show causes have been filed on their behalf, which are taken on record.

The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the learned G.P. 8, appearing on behalf of the opposite parties, are unanimous in their submissions that the order dated 27.11.2014 passed in CWJC No. 6121 of 2014 (Annexure-1) by the writ Court has practically been complied with. However, the learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, submits that some grievances of the writ petitioner are yet to be redressed, but for that he seeks leave of this Court to file representation before the competent authority.

In view of the aforesaid submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties, the present M.J.C. application stands disposed of as infructuous, since the order of the writ Court has practically been complied with. Personal appearance of the opposite parties are no longer required, since they have purged themselves from the charge of contempt.

However, if any representation is filed on behalf of the petitioner for redressal of his valid grievances, then it is expected that the competent authority shall consider and decide that representation strictly in accordance with law.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

BTiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--