

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.5596 of 2012

=====

Smt. Kusum Kumari W/o Sri Ram Krishna Prasad, Resident of Village-
Kakhara, P.S- Noor Sarai, District- Nalanda, at present Residing at
Mohalla- Gandhi Colony, Soh Sarai, P.S- Soh Sarai, District- Nalanda.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vyash Ji, Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development
Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Ashutosh Pandey Director Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. Ashok Kumar Singh, son of not known to the petitioner, District
Programme Officer, Nalanda-cum-District Superintendent of Education,
Nalanda at Bihar Sharif
5. Deosheel, son of not known to the petitioner, District Education Officer,
Nalanda at Bihar Sharif
6. Deepa Rani Sahu, wife of not known to the petitioner, Principal, District
Teachers Training Institute, Noor Sarai, Nalanda
7. A.D.S. Dhaliwal, son f not known to the petitioner, Accountant General,
Bihar, Patna
8. Daya Shankar, son of not known to the petitioner, District Provident
Fund Officer, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif

.... Opp. Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Nivedita Nirvikar, G.P. 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA
ORAL ORDER

9 17-02-2016 It is evident from the computation chart produced by the

opposite party that interest has been calculated till 31st March,

2014 while making payment of balance amount of Rs.1,04,684/-

on 7.4.2015, whereas the same calculation chart shows that

interest had been calculated at the rate of 8.70% or whatever was

the prevailing rate as on 31st March, 2015 and it came to

Rs.9,108/- which was in fact calculated and again subtracted by

the same amount and on 31st March, 2015 Rs.1,04,684/- has been shown as payable.

In the aforesaid circumstances, the opposite parties are clearly liable to pay interest amount of Rs.9,108/- to the petitioner. Let the same be done within a period of two weeks from today.

So far as other claims of the petitioner are concerned, they have been denied by the opposite parties.

This Court in its contempt jurisdiction will not look into the matter so as to adjudicate the claim of the petitioner.

The contempt application is, accordingly, disposed of.

However, the petitioner shall have liberty to raise any other claim before any appropriate forum in accordance with law.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--