

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3377 of 2015

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 5834 of 2012

=====

Dr. Shivanand Bhagat Son of Late Ganga Prasad Bhagat Resident of
Village - Pachkothiya, P.O. & P.S. - Shahkund, District - Bhagalpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary Animal Husbandry
Department Namely Harjot Kaur
2. The Director Animal Husbandry, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Hare Ram
Singh
3. The Director Provident Fund Finance Department, Govt. of Bihar Pant
Bhawan Patna namely Rameshwar Singh
4. The District Provident Fund Officer Bhagalpur District Bhagalpur
namely Vindu Vadini
5. The Block District Officer Amarapur District Banka namely Gayatri Devi
6. The State of Jharkhand through Principal Secretary Animal Husbandry
Department Govt. of Jharkhand Ranchi namely Nitin Madan Kulkarni
7. The Accountant General Bihar, Patna namely Sanjay Kumar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Vinay Prasad Singh (Sanjay)
For the State : Mr. Amar Nath Deo
For the Jharkhand State Mr. Dhurba Mukherjee

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 20-01-2016 Heard counsel for the petitioner and the opposite parties.

The application raised a grievance that the order dated
18.09.2013 passed in MJC No. 5834 of 2012 has been
deliberately/willfully violated/defied by the opposite parties.

The petitioner filed the writ petition vide CWJC No.
8457 of 2010 which was disposed of permitting the petitioner to
raise a grievance before the District Provident Fund Officer, who

was directed to examine and redress the same within a time-frame. A contempt application was thereafter filed in which the Court, considering the materials on record, found that the opposite party had not willfully/deliberately defied/violated the order of the Court. However, with regard to some of the GPF dues of 1971 to 1978 a liberty was granted to approach the Director, Provident Fund, Department of Finance, who was required to examine and redress the grievance. It is submitted that the representation(s) was/were filed before all the appropriate authorities, but the grievance has not been redressed. As noted above, this Court had recorded its finding in the order dated 18.09.2013 that the opposite party had not willfully/deliberately disregarded/violated the order of the Court passed on the writ petition and only a liberty was granted to the petitioner. No positive direction was issued.

In the circumstances, I do not find any merit in this contempt application. It is accordingly dismissed.

The petitioner, if so advised, may seek his remedy in accordance with law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--