

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3322 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 511 of 2015

- =====
1. Ganeshi Das son of Ganour Das R/o Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 2. Ram Murti Mandal son of Late Jogeshwar Mandal R/o Village Annugua, P.S. - Katra, District - Muzaffarpur.
 3. Shivjee Das Son of Jagdev Das resident of Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 4. Shiv Narayan Das Son of Jagdev Das resident of Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 5. Kallar Das Son of Late Anup Das resident of Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 6. Dev Narayan Das Son of Late Achchhe Das resident of Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 7. Shankar Das Son of Late Monglal Das resident of Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 8. Md. Manna Son of Late Alamgir resident of Village - Mahisoutha, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 9. Indal Das Son of Kallar Das R/o Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 10. Most. Salpha Khatoon wife of Late Md. Rajaul R/o Village - Mahisoutha, P.S. Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 11. Ram Babu Das Son of Late Ram Udhar Das R/o Village - Bathaul, P.S. - Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Mr. Sudhir Kumar the Home Secretary Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Amir Subbhani the Home Commissioner, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Mr. P.K. Thakur, the Director General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
5. Mr. Paras Nath, the Inspector General of Police, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
6. Mr. P.K. Shrivastava the Deputy Inspector General of Police Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
7. Mr. Rajeev Raushan, the District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
8. Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Singh, the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
9. Mr. Ranjit Kumar Mishra, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur.
10. Mr. Mustafic Ahmad the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur.
11. Mr. Hari Prasad, the Senior Superintendent of Police Sitamarhi.
12. Mr. Ajit Kumar Satyarthi, the Senior Superintendent of Police Darbhanga.
13. Mr. Maheshwar Pandit, Block Development Officer Nanpur Kokhara, Muzaffarpur.
14. Mr. Amarjeet Kumar, the Block Development Officer, Katra, Muzaffarpur.
15. Mr. Lalan Kumar, the Officer Incharge, Nanpur Police Station, Sitamarhi.
16. Mr. Ram Eqbal Yadav, the Officer Incharge, Katra Police Station, Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. V.K. Singh, G.A.3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 02-03-2016

The office reports that there is a typographical error in the cause title of order No.4 dated 17.2.2016 which reads as 'C.W.J.C.No.3322 of 2015' in place of 'M.J.C.No.3322 of 2015'.

Let the cause title of the order no. 4 dated 17.2.2016 be modified to read as 'M.J.C.No.3322 of 2015' in place of 'C.W.J.C.No.3322 of 2015' and shall be deemed to have been pronounced accordingly.

This contempt application is filed alleging non compliance of the order dated 11.2.2015 passed in C.W.J.C.No.511 of 2014. This matter was taken up on 3.2.2016 and it was admitted by Mr. Pramod Kumar Singh that in so far as petitioner Nos. 1 and 3 to 11 are concerned, their claim stands disposed of by the District Magistrate, Sitamarhi. That left only the petitioner No.2.

In so far as petitioner No.2 is concerned, the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur filed his show cause to inform that although the petitioner No.2 is a resident of Muzaffarpur but since he had surrendered at Darbhanga hence as per the guidelines it is the District Magistrate, Darbhanga who shall be the appropriate authority to consider and dispose of the claim of the petitioner

No.2. It is in consideration of the show cause filed by the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur that the District Magistrate, Darbhanga was directed to file his show cause and which was filed on 17.2.2016. On request of Mr. Singh the matter was passed over and is taken up today when Mr. Singh fairly admits that even the claim of the petitioner No.2 has been disposed of by the District Magistrate but not to the liking of the petitioner who complains that it is not in accordance with the Scheme.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the show cause filed on behalf of the authorities, disposing of the claim of these petitioners which may not be to their liking and even if according to the petitioners, the disposal is not in tune with the Rehabilitation Scheme in question, they shall be at liberty to raise such issue by filing an appropriate application before the appropriate forum.

In the circumstances set forth, this contempt application stands disposed of.

Bibhash/-

(Jyoti Saran, J)

U			
---	--	--	--