

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3637 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 205 of 2014

=====

Rajiv Ranjan Sinha, Son of Sri Ashok Kumar Sinha, Resident of Village-Simri, P.S.- Vidyapathi Nagar, District- Samastipur (Bihar).

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shri Pranav Kumar, Son of not known to the petitioner, District Magistrate, Samastipur, Government of Bihar.
3. Shri Nawal Kishore Singh, Son of not known to the petitioner, Superintendent of Police, Samastipur, Government of Bihar.
4. Shri Manoj Kumar, Son of not known to the petitioner, Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Dalsingsarai, Samastipur.
5. Shri Md. Anwar Javed Ansari, Son of not known to the petitioner, Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Dalsinghsarai, Samastipur.
6. Shri Ramesh Kumar, Son of not known to the petitioner, Executive Magistrate-cum-Circle Officer, Circle- Vidyapati Nagar, District-Samastipur.
7. Shri Iqbal Ahmad Khan, Son of not known to the petitioner, Officer-In-Charge of Vidyapatinagar Police Station, Samastipur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Bhagat, AC to AAG-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 13-09-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner complained that he was not being allowed to construct the boundary wall by certain antisocial elements and his plea before the police authorities have not been responded to. It is taking note of the grievance raised by the petitioner that the writ petition was disposed of with the liberty to him to file an appropriate application before the Superintendent of Police and the Officer In-charge of Vidyapatinagar Police Station in case he is obstructed by any person in construction of the



boundary wall. The order also required the petitioner to give details of the offenders so that effective action could be taken by the Superintendent of Police.

While the petitioner relies upon the representation at Annexures 2 series to inform that no action was taken but, in my opinion, the representations at Annexures 2 series before the Superintendent of Police and the Officer In-charge, Vidyapati Nagar Police Station, is not in tune with the obligation cast on the petitioner, of giving details of the offenders putting obstruction in construction of the boundary wall and thus, could not have been the basis for any action. Paragraph 7 of the representation makes a vague allegation on unknown offenders. In my opinion, where the petitioner himself has not discharged his obligation to give full information to the Superintendent of Police, Samastipur or the Officer In-charge of Vidyapati Nagar Police Station, the vague representation required no further action.

It is informed by Mr. Arun Kumar Bhagat, learned AC to AAG-12, that some kind of action has been initiated by the respondents on the vague representation. In either situation the contempt application, as it stands, requires no further persuasion and is disposed of accordingly.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

