

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1704 of 2017

=====

Arun Kumar, S/o Sri Rama Nand Singh, R/o Pakri, Opposite Block Office,
Punpun, P.O. & P.S. Punpun, District Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. Amrit Lal Meena, I. A. S.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Additional Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. L.N. Das.
3. Mr. Rajendra Pd. Gupta, the then Joint Secretary & presently the O.S.D.-cum-Additional Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Deputy Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. Mithilesh Kumar.
5. The Department Promotion Committee through the Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. Amrit Lal Meena, I.A.S.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Purushottam Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raj Ballabh Pd. Yadav, AAG-11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 29-11-2017 Heard the parties.

A supplementary show cause has been filed on behalf of the opposite party no.2 in compliance of the order passed on 15.11.2017 and the statements made in paragraph 4 to 7 thereof are sufficient to close the proceedings because whereas at paragraph 4 it is mentioned that 2nd MACP has been granted to the petitioner vide order bearing Memo No.6719 dated 28.11.2017 with effect from 1.4.2012, in so far as the issue of regular promotion is concerned, paragraph 5 to 7 would reflect that process has been initiated and the panel has been put on the



website inviting objections and the opposite parties have intended to complete the process within the expected period of one month. The time is reasonable and the Court is satisfied with the initiative taken by the opposite parties.

The contempt application is disposed of with a reminder to the opposite party nos.1 and 2 to conclude the process preferably within the time framed fixed by them.

It goes without saying that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the date of grant of MACP, he shall be at liberty to question the same before the appropriate forum, who shall consider and dispose of the same by a speaking order expeditiously and preferably within six weeks of its filing.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

