

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3282 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12661 of 2011

- =====
1. The Bihar Electricity Board, Patna, Vidyut Bhawan , Bailey Road , Patna through its Champaran.
 2. The Chairman, Bihar State Electricity Board, Bailey Road, Patna
 3. The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Bihar, Patna
 4. The General Manager- cum- Chief Engineer, Magadh Electric Supply Area Gaya.
 5. The Deputy Director of Personnel, Magadh Electricity Supply Area, Gaya
 6. The Deputy Director of Accounts, Magadh Electric Supply Area, Gaya.
 7. The Electrical Superintending Electric Supply Circle, Gaya

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Uma Nath Pandey, Son of Late Sukhdeo Pandey , R/o Raghunath Road , Chandauti More, house no 264, Gaya , P.S - Rampur Gaya , District - Gaya
2. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Department of Energy, Govt. of Bihar Patna
3. The Secretary, Department, of Energy, Govt. of Bihar Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Namrata Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 19-05-2017 Heard Smt. Namrata Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Lalan Kumar, learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of Respondent no.1/ writ petitioner.

The present petition was filed with a prayer to modify an order dated 08.09.2015 passed in C.W.J.C.No.12661 of 2011 only to the extent of recalling order, whereby direction was given to pay interest on the withheld amount, if payment is not made, within a period of eight weeks from the date of



receipt/production of copy of the order.

Learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that after the order of the writ court, due amount with interest as per direction has already been given to the petitioner. Even thereafter, she tried to persuade the Court to modify the order to the extent direction was given to pay interest on the withheld amount within eight weeks.

In view of facts and circumstances, the Court is of the opinion that there is no reason to interfere with the order. Moreover, since the order has already been complied with, there is no reason to interfere with the modification petition. The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--

