

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2388 of 2016

IN

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 3951 of 2009

=====

Teepan Prasad Singh, son of Mathura Pd Singh R/o Vill Chakjan, P.O.- Sarasat,
P.S. Naubatpur, Dist- Patna

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Dept of Road Construction, Bihar, Patna namely Shri Pankaj Kumar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Dept of Road Construction, Bihar, Patna Namely Shri Pankaj Kumar.
3. The Principal Secretary, Dept of Finance, Govt. of Bihar, Patna, namely Shri Ravi Mittal.
4. The Principal Secretary, Dept of Rural Works, Bihar, Patna namely Shri Vinay Kumar
5. The Engineer-in chief –cum- Additional Secretary, Dept of Road Construction, Bihar, Patna namely Shri Laxmi Narayan Das.
6. The Engineer-in chief -cum- Additional Secretary, Dept of Rural Works, Bihar, Patna namely Shri Kamlesh Choudhary
7. The Chief Engineer, Dept of Road Construction, South Bihar, Patna namely Shri Bhaweani Nandan.
8. The Chief Enginer-1, Department of Rural Works, Rural Works Department, South Bihar, Patna namely Shri Kamlesh Choudhary.
9. The Executive Engineer, Dept. of Road Construction, Sahabad Division, Ara, Bhojpur namely Shri Umesh Kumar.
10. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Division, Gaya namely Shri Subhash Chandra Maharaj.
11. The Treasury officer, Sinchai Bhawan, old Secretariat, Patna namely, Shri Prem Pushpa Kumar.
12. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna namely Shri S. Suresh Kumar null null

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Parasmani, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. R.B. Prasad Yadav, A.A.G.-11



Mr. Ramashray Roy, A.C. to A.A.G-11
For the Accountant General: Mr. Raghwanand, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date: 17-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties..

In this case, the petitioner is claiming that the order passed in M.J.C. No.3951 of 2009 having not been complied with as the order dated 3.12.2013 passed by the authority is a non-speaking order.

In pursuance of the order passed by this Court, the authority has examined the case of the petitioner and rejected the same vide order dated 03.12.2013.

In such view of the matter, this Court is of the view that there is no need to proceed further in the matter. Accordingly, this contempt proceeding is dropped. The petitioner, if so advised, may challenge the order passed by the authority before the appropriate Court/Forum.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N/A.
Uploading Date	19.07.2017
Transmission Date	N/A.

