

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.6209 of 2013

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 87 of 2011

=====

1. Rameshwar Prasad Son Of Late Hari Charan Prasad Resident Of Village - Mahiarpur, P.S. Tekari, District - Gaya, Presently Residing At A/364 (A), A.G. Colony, P.S. Shastrinagar, District - Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna, Presently Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha
3. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department (Higher Education Department), Patna, Presently Mr. Amarjeet Sinha
4. The Director, Higher Education, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna, Presently Mr. Sita Ram Singh
5. The Magadh University Through The Vice Chancellor, Bodh Gaya, Presently Mr. Nand Kumar
6. The Financial Advisor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Presently Mr.
7. The Finance Officer, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Presently Mr. Devesh Kumar Sinha
8. The Principal, Ram Lakhan Singh Yadav College, Bakhtiyarpur, District - Patna, Presently Mr. Jay Ram Chakravarti

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharmendra Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, AC to SC-28
For the University : Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 28-06-2017

Inter alia contending that an order passed by this Court on 11.12.2012 in C.W.J.C. No.87 of 2011 has not been complied with, this application has been filed for initiating action for contempt.

From the show cause and the supplementary show cause filed by the respondents, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner has been considered and a detailed order has been passed deciding his



claim.

That being so, now it is not appropriate to initiate any action for contempt. Instead, in case the petitioner has any grievance with regard to the manner in which the dispute has been adjudicated and the claim settled, the same gives a fresh cause of action to the petitioner for ventilating his grievance afresh, but not a cause for initiating action for contempt.

Accordingly, finding no case for indulgence, this 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	1.7.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

