

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.553 of 2014

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18773 of 2012

=====

Smt. Sumitra Devi, aged about 61 years, Wife Of Late Dhaneshwar Chauha,
Ex-Lineman, Electric Supply Sub-Division Araria, Resident Of Shashtri
Nagar, Ward No. 11, P.O.+P.S.+District- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Sri Sandip Paundrik, Energy Department, Sichai Bhawan, Kranti Marg, Patna- 1.
2. Sri Sandip Paundrik, Bihar State Power Holding Company Ltd. Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. Smt. Kriti Kiran, Company Secretary, Bihar State Power Holding Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. Sri Balram Singh, Electrical Superintending Engineer Incharge Of Koshi Area Electric Supply At & P.O. District- Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ramnandan Kr. Sinha, Advocate Mr. N. K. Nirala, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. H. S. Sundaram, AC to SC 28
For the Board	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Senior Advocate Mr. Vijay Kr. Verma, Advocate Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-10-2017

Inter alia contending that an order dated 23.07.2013 passed in CWJC No.18773 of 2012 has not been complied with, this application has been filed for initiating action for contempt.

Petitioner's husband was working in the Bihar State Electricity Board and died due to electrocution while on duty. The compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act was paid to the petitioner and her son was also granted compassionate appointment. However, when the claim as per the Compensation Accident Scheme, 1983 and other dues were not paid, the writ



petition was filed and the writ petition was disposed of with a direction that in case, the petitioner files an application, the competent authority of the Board, namely respondent No.2, shall decide the grievance of the petitioner.

Now, from the show cause filed by the respondents and the documents brought on record, particularly Office Order No.179 dated 29.05.2014 and the enclosures enclosed therewith, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner has been settled by payment of compensation pension and family pension and all other monetary dues.

That being so, in view of the compliance reported by the respondents, now, no further action is required to be taken in this contempt proceedings. However, in case, the petitioner has any grievance still subsisting with regard to the manner in which the claims have been settled, she may challenge the same afresh in accordance with law, but finding no case made out for initiating action for contempt, this application stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

Sunil/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.10.2017
Transmission Date	

