

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3387 of 1999

=====

Rajan Kumar Pandey, Son of Sri Gauri Shankar Pandey, resident of
Village- Mathia Brit Biathania, P.S. Majholia, District-West Champaran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Bihar.
2. Sri Mohan Chand Mukim, District Education Officer, Bettiah, West Champaran.
3. Anil Kumar Srivastava, the then Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Gauri Shankar Prasad, Incharge, Director, Secondary, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
5. Sri Dhananjay Kumar, Regional Deputy Director, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. R.K.Shukla, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. G.P. 4.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA)

2 01-04-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

The contempt application has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 27.11.1996 passed by this Court in M.J.C. No. 1125 of 1993.

In the show cause filed on behalf of opposite party no. 2, it is stated that pursuant to the direction of this Court, the Director, Primary Education, issued a letter dated 12.11.1997 as also the Regional Deputy Director of Education, Tirhut Division,

Muzaffarpur, issued letters dated 27.03.1994, 18.11.1997, 11.07.2000 and 26.07.2000 with respect to the joining of the petitioner and thereafter, the petitioner also joined in the Project Girls High School, Madhepur, West Champaran, on 22.09.2000 as a Clerk and the Headmistress of the School accepted the joining report dated 22.09.2000 and since then he was regularly working there.

Learned counsel for the petitioner makes a grievance that subsequently the petitioner was again terminated. Subsequent termination can not be a ground for alleging violation of the order of this Court which is a fresh cause of action for which appropriate remedy does not lie by way of contempt application. The contempt application is, accordingly, dismissed.

It is, however, open to the petitioner to avail his remedy in appropriate proceedings against the action of the opposite parties in accordance with law.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Sudip/U.K./-

U			
---	--	--	--