

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.965 of 2014

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1270 of 2013

=====

1. Narsingh Mishra, Retired Accountant, Electric Supply Division, Aurangabad,
Son Of Late Jag Narain Mishra Resident Of Village Karpi, P.O.- Jakhim, P.S.
Rafiganj, District- Aurangabad

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Shri Sandeep Poundrik, Principal Secretary,
Energy Department, Null Government Of Bihar, Serpentine Road, Patna-
800001
2. Shri Sandeep Pondrik, Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Power
(Holding) Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna- 800021
3. Ms. Kirti Kiran, Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna- 800021
4. Shri Pramod Tiwary, Dy. General Manager, Bihar State Power (Holding)
Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna
5. Shri Mohan Singh, Account Officer, Gaya Electric Circle, Katari Road, Gaya

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Vijay Kr. Verma, Advocate
Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate
Mr. Vivek Anand Amiritesh, AC to SC-28

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 23-05-2017

On 2.8.2013, after considering the facts and
circumstances of the case, it was directed that in case the petitioner
files a fresh representation before the respondent Company, his



grievance shall be considered and all admissible dues paid to him within a period of four months.

From the show cause filed by the respondents, it is seen that after disposal of the matter on 2.8.2013, revised gratuity of Rs.1,89,385/- was paid to the petitioner vide Cheque as detailed in Annexure-A on 24.2.2014, a sum of Rs.1,30,519/- as arrears of revised pay and a sum of Rs.59,289/- as revised leave encashment was paid to the petitioner vide cheque as detailed in Annexure-A dated 18.1.2014.

However, revised pension arrears as claimed by the successor was not paid due to not submitting the required form in accordance to the Rules. The show cause detailing all these facts have been filed by the respondents indicating how the claim and representation of the petitioner with regard to demands and claims have been settled.

That being so, now it is not appropriate to initiate any action for contempt.

In case the petitioner or his successor has any grievance still subsisting pursuant to the compliance reported by the respondents, he may initiate proceedings afresh in accordance with law, but in the light of the nature of the order passed in the writ



petition and the compliance reported by the respondents, it is not a fit case where action for contempt can be initiated.

The contempt application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	25.5.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

