

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.336 of 2010

=====

1. Kumar Rameshwar Lal S/O Late Bankey Lal Das R/O Ritupur, Po- Tejpur, Via-Tulapat Ganj, Distt- Madhuban, At Present R/O Bhandari Bhawan, Jhanjharpur, Retired Ssistant Superintendent, Physical Education Araria

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Secretary, Art, Culture And Youth Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
2. Vivek Singh The Secretary, Art Culture, And Youth Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Vikash Bhawan, Patna
3. 3. Rajeev Ranjan Prasad District Education Officer, Madhubani
4. Kumar Rakesh District Provident Fund Officer, Madhubani
5. D.S. Dhariwal Accountant General, Bihar, Patna
6. Name Not Known The Accountant General, U.P. Allahabad

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bankey Bihari Singh, Advocate
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Shailendra Prasad
Mr. Manoj Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kinker Kumar, SC-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-06-2017

Inter alia contending that directions issued by this Court in the writ petition have not been complied with and the benefit accruing to the petitioner, particularly with regard to settlement of his provident fund schemes, have not been adjudicated and settled properly and interest has not been paid, this application has been filed.

A detailed show cause along with documents and statement showing settlement of the claim along with payment of



interest and the reason for non-payment of interest for the period with reference to the provisions governing the payment of provident fund have been filed by the respondents and they have tried to justify the reasons as to why the amount cannot be paid. Now in the backdrop of the reply filed by the respondents, the dispute with regard to the claim which remains unsettled, particularly with regard to the payment of interest, cannot be adjudicated in these contempt proceedings.

In case the petitioner has any grievance with regard to manner in which the claim has been settled, the petitioner may challenge the same in accordance with, but on such consideration a case for contempt is not made out.

The application is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty to the petitioner.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	28.6.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

