

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2219 of 2015

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 9331 of 2011

=====

1. Meena Kumari Wife of Shyam Nandan Shashi resident of village -
Agargarha, Police Station - Marauna, District - Supaul

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary namely Sri Anjani Kumar Singh
2. Sr. R.K. Mahajan, the Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Sri Laxmi Chauhan, The District Magistrate, Supaul
4. Sri J.P. Singh, the District Superintendent of Education, Supaul
5. Sri Sushil Kumar Mandal, the Block Development officer, Marauna, Supaul
6. Sri S.K. Verma, the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Nirmali, Supaul
7. Sri Satish Srivastava, the Block Education Extension officer, Marauna, Supaul
8. Sri Md. Ezaz Alam, the Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Marauna, Supaul
9. Sri Digamber Yadav, the Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Marauna South, Supaul
10. Sri Md. Zaffar Alam, the Head Master, Primary School, Janardanpur, Marauna, Supaul
11. The District Teacher Employment Appellate Authority, Supaul through its Member namely Sri P.K. Singh
12. Sri Nageshwar Yadav Son of Sri Ram Krishna Yadav resident of village - Akshamaita, Kamrail, Supaul

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nagendra Pd. Yadav

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

4 10-02-2016

Heard both sides.

The application seeks initiation of contempt proceeding against the opposite parties no. 8 and 9 for having willfully/deliberately disregarded the order dated 14.11.2013

passed in CWJC No. 9331 of 2011 (Annexure-1). On perusal of the order it appears the Court declined to interfere with the order and only observed the employment committee/selection committee to examine the claim of the petitioner in accordance with law. The matter pertains to the period when the petitioner and/or others were engaged/employed as Panchayat Shiksha Mitra. Counsel for the State has pointed out that any enquiry to the said engagement after coming into force of the 2016 Rules cannot be made. That apart the Court, while disposing of the writ application, did not grant any relief to the petitioner. If that be the case then how a contempt application would be maintainable for implementation of the order. For non compliance of the order of the Tribunal the aggrieved party can move the District Magistrate or appropriate authority under the amended provisions.

I find no merit in the contempt application. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Shyam/-

U			
---	--	--	--