

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1019 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11334 of 2011

=====

Rajendra Prasad Jaiswal, son of lae Ram Lakhan Jaiswal, resident of village
& P.O. Naokothi, Police Sttion Naokothi, District- Begusarai

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shri G.S.Gangwar, the Principal Secrtary, Human Resources Development Department (Now Education Department), Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Shri Rameshwar Singh, the Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. Shri Raja Ram, the Deputy Secretary, Finance (Pay fixation) Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
5. Mr. M. Ramchandra Tuddu, the Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna
6. Mr. Naushad Yusuf, the District Magistrate, Begusarai
7. M.Kanchan Kapoor, the Deputy Development Commissioner-cum-Chairman, District Education Establishment Committee, Begusarai
8. M. Rajendra Das, the District Superintendent of Education, Munger (now District Programme Officer, Munger)
9. Vijy Kumar, the District Superintendent of Education, Begusarai (now District Programme Officer (Establishment), Begusarai
10. Mr. Nirbhay Kumar, the District Treasury Officer, Begusarai
11. Mr. Ramesh Kumar Barnwal, the District Accounts Officer, Begusarai
12. Shri Mahendra Poddar, the Drawing and Disbursing Officer of Govt. Middle School, Bhagwati Asthan Lakho, District- Begusarai

.... Opp.Parties

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR
DATTA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the State.

A show cause has been filed on behalf of the

opposite party No. 9, the District Programme Officer
(Establishment), Begusarai in which it is stated that pursuant to

the order under contempt the order dated 13.4.2016 has been



passed considering the claim of the petitioner which has been ultimately rejected on the basis of the decision of this Court.

In the above circumstances, the order under contempt has been complied with and the contempt application is, accordingly, dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for a liberty to challenge the said order dated 13.4.2016. No such liberty is required as in case if the petitioner is aggrieved by the said order, it is always open to him to assail the same in appropriate proceedings.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

S.Pandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--

