

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.147 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10800 of 2013

=====

1. Yogendra Prasad Bhakta Son of Late Chhatradhari Bhagat Resident of village Haribella, P.S. Bathnaha, District Sitamarhi

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Mr. Beyas Jee Son of not known to the petitioner the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Dr. Pratima, Daughter of Not known to the petitioner The Collector, Sitamarhi.
3. Mr. Ashok Kumar Pal Son of not known to the petitioner, The Special land Acquisition officer Gandak Project, Muzaffarpur.
4. Mr. Om Prakash Ambedkar Son of Not known to the petitioner The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department Muzaffarpur.
5. Mr. Ram Vijay Singh Son of Not known to the petitioner The Superintending Engineer, Shirsha work circle, Bagmatinagar, Sitamarhi.
6. Ram Vinay Sinha, Son of not known to the petitioner The Executive Engineer, Bagmati Pramandal no. 1 Sitamarhi.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kundan Bhadur Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 02-03-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is making a prayer for initiation of contempt proceeding against the opposite parties for non-compliance of the order dated 19.06.2014 passed in C.W.J.C. No.10800 of 2013.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on earlier occasion this Court did not accept the order passed by

opposite parties, as the same was not strictly followed the provisions of the principles of natural justice. This Court has recorded that in perfunctory manner, order was passed without giving any opportunity to the land-holder, and later on, the case was adjourned. Subsequently, though they have given an opportunity of hearing to the land-holder and passed the order, but the same is replica of earlier order.

This Court cannot direct the respondents that in what manner they will pass the order.

In such view of the matter, the contempt proceeding is dropped and the petition is dismissed. The petitioner may take legal action against order dated 7.12.2015, if so advised.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--