

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1434 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20560 of 2013

- =====
1. Jai Prakash Sah son of Sri Ram Sagar Sah, resident of village Pathepur Saraya P.S. Manjhi, District Saran at Chapra.
 2. Vijay Kumar Sah, son of Sri Lal Babu Sah, resident of village Bishanpura, P.S. Jalalpur, District Saran at Chapra.
 3. Ramanand Sah, son of late Ramayan Sah, resident of village Nawada Mathia, P.S. Jalalpur, District Saran at Chapra.
 4. Jitendra Kumar Sah, son of Sri Ram Laxman Sah, resident of village Rasulpur, P.S. Dermi District Saran at Chapra.
 5. Sudama Prasad Sahi, son of Sri Kanhaiya Prasad Sah, resident of village Parsagarh, P.S. Ekma, District Saran at Chapra.
 6. Ramayan Prasad, son of Late Ram Briksh Sah, resident of village Maripar, P.S. Damrhar, District Saran at Chapra.
 7. Braj Kishore Saw, son of Sri Ram Ayodhya Prasad, resident of village Pachrukhiya, P.S. Kopa, District Saran at Chapra.
 8. Anil Kumar Sah, son of Late Jitan Sah, resident of village Aalampur, P.S. Derari, District Saran at Chapra.
 9. Sheoji Sah, son of Sri Chulhan Sah, resident of village Manjhi Bhatoli, P.S. Manjhi, District Saran at Chapra.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department Govt. of Bihar Patna namely Mr. D.S.Gangwar
2. The Director Primary Education Bihar Patna namely Mr. Lalan Jee.
3. The D.E.O. Saran at Chapra namely Mr. Sudhir Kumar.
4. The D.E.O Muzaffarpur namely Mr. Ravi Kumar.
5. The Director Provident Fund Directorate, Pant Bhawan Patna namely Sri Arun Kumar Mishra.
6. The District Provident Fund Officer Saran at Chapra namely Mr. Ravindra Kumar Singh.
7. The District Provident Fund Officer, Muzaffarpur namely Mr. Shashi Shekhar Sharma.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Keshri

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

2 13-08-2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner admits that the



order under contempt application has already been complied with by disposing off the representation of the petitioner.

The grievance of the petitioner is that he has been paid after a long time and for that he is required to be compensated by making payment of interest may be an independent cause which the petitioner may apply for in appropriate proceeding.

So far as contempt application is concerned, it has become infructuous. It is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

