

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.336 of 2017

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2075 of 2007

=====

Arun Kumar Singh Son of Baldeo Prasad Singh Resident of village- Konara
P.O. Konara P.S. Harsi District Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary Government of Bihar, Patna
Sri A. K. Singh
2. The Principal Secretary, Home (Police) Dep. Sri Amir Subhani
3. The D.G. of Police Bihar, Patna Sri P.K. Thakur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 24-01-2018

Inter alia contending that an order passed by this Court on 16.08.2011 in C.W.J.C. No. 2075 of 2007 has not been complied with, this application has been filed for initiating action for contempt.

Office has pointed out various defects, they were not rectified and even after time was granted on 28.08.2017, none appeared before the office and the defects have not been



rectified. Even today, when the matter is taken up, none is present and the defects have not been rectified.

Keeping in view the aforesaid, I have gone through the records and it is seen that on 16.08.2011 the writ petition was disposed of with the following order:-

“After some argument learned counsel for the petitioner has chosen to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to represent before the superior police authority to reduce the punishment of dismissal into compulsory retirement in view of the orders of the High Court dated 9.1.2006 passed in the case of Ravindra Kumar Bhatt in C.W.J.C. No. 8285 of 2004, Annexure-12.

With the liberty aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of.”

From the aforesaid, it is clear that after arguing the matter for certain time, the petitioner's counsel chose to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to represent to the authorities for reduction of the punishment. The petition was disposed of with the aforesaid liberty. However, no direction was issued by the Court to decide any representation nor was any time limit fixed for decision on the representation.

That being so, on the ground that the case of the petitioner has not been considered, I see no reason to initiate any



action for contempt. In case the petitioner has any grievance with regard to the issue in question, and if law permits, petitioner may initiate fresh proceedings in accordance with law.

With the aforesaid, finding this not a fit case for initiating action for contempt, the application stands dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

P.K.P./-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	27.01.2018
Transmission Date	

