

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4853 of 2014

=====

Krishna Kant Ojha S/o Shri Rameshwar Ojha Resident of Village
Kawalpatti, P.S. Bihiya, District Bhojpur Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through the home Secretary namely S.N. Dhila ministry of home affairs, New Delhi.
 2. The Director general namely Dileep Diwadi CRPF CGO Complex, Lodhi Road New Delhi.
 3. The DIG Namely Niraj Kumar Group Centre CRPF Jhaphan, Muzaffarpur, Bihar
 4. The D.I.G. namely Raj Kumar Group Centre, CRPF, Mokama Ghat, Bihar
 5. The Medical officer namely AruN Kumar Composite hospital Jammu group Centre, CRPF, Bantalab, Jammu & Kashmir Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pranav Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Asstt. Sol. General of India

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA
PRATAP SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 14-09-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the Union of India.

In this contempt petition, the petitioner alleges that there has been willful disobedience of order dated 29. 8.2014, passed in C.W.J.C.No. 20401 of 2011.

The facts of the case is that the petitioner applied for the post of constable GD in the CRPF. He was declared unfit due to colour blindness and squint on 21.1.2011. On petitioner's appeal, he was subjected to the Review Medical Board on 17.3.2011. However, he was again declared unfit by the Review Medical Board. Petitioner, by filing writ petition, sought review of the

report of the Review Medical Board, dated 17.3.2011 on the ground that fitness certificates dated 28.1.2011 and 5.11.2011 were overlooked by the Medical Review Board. This Court disposed of the matter with the liberty to the petitioner to file fresh representation before the authorities.

Representation of the petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 8.1.2015 stating that after Review Medical Examination, there is no provision to conduct re-medical examination of medically unfit candidate. The petitioner submits that his representation has been wrongly rejected, as he has been shown medically fit for the period in question, vide fitness certificates dated 28.11.2011 and 5.11.2011.

In my view, as the representation of the petitioner has been disposed of, this Court would have limited jurisdiction to consider its correctness. The contempt application is thus closed with liberty to the petitioner to take resort to remedy available under law.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J)

Shashi

U			
---	--	--	--