

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 3960 of 2012

=====

Baleshwar Pd. Sinha S/O Late Bhola Prasad Sinha R/O Mohalla- Ganesh Lal Road, Near Jalan High School, P.O- Begampur, P.S- Chowk, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sri Afjal Amanullah, Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri Devi Rajak, Engineer in Chief Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Sri Kamla Kant, Chief Engineer, Water Resource Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Sri Rejendra Prasad Srivastava, Superintending Engineer, Water Wage Circle, Gaya.
6. Sri Arun Kumar Srivastava, Executive Engineer, Tilaiya Canel Division, Gaya.
7. Mr. I.D.S. Dhariwal, The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.
8. Mr. Ashok Kumar, The Provident Fund Officer, Gaya.

.... Opposite Parties/Contemners

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramanuj Tiwary
For the Opp. Party/s : Mr. Raghwanand

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6. 07-12-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Raghwanand, learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of opposite party no. 7/Accountant General.

The present petition was filed with a prayer to initiate contempt proceeding against opposite parties on an allegation of wilful disobedience to an order dated 10-03-2011 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 4579 of 2011.

In this case, earlier show cause was filed on behalf of



opposite party no. 6, wherein it was indicated that almost all the grievances of the petitioner have already been redressed. However, regarding completion of certain formalities, a stand was taken that despite best effort taken by the department, petitioner had never appeared, even press publication was made.

Sri Raghwanand, learned counsel for the Accountant General, by way of referring to paragraph – 6 of the show cause of opposite party no. 7, submits that on receipt of sanction order from the State Government, authorization was already issued in the year 2014 in respect of revised pension and gratuity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite his best effort, he has not been able to get any further instruction from the petitioner, whereas, earlier on number of occasions, the case was adjourned to enable learned counsel for the petitioner to get further instruction.

In view of facts and circumstances, there is no reason to keep the matter pending.

The petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--

