

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2860 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 6928 of 2011

=====

Dr. Pramod Kumar Verma, son of Late Rama Kant Verma, permanent resident of 224/A, Patliputra Colony, P.S.- Patliputra, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Mr. Anjani Kumar Singh, The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. R.K. Mahajan, I.A.S., son of not known to the petitioner, the Principal Secretary, Health Medical Education-cum-Family Welfare Department, Patna (Bihar).
3. Mr. Anil Kumar, son of not known to the petitioner, The Deputy Secretary to the Government, Health, Medical Education-cum-Family Welfare Department, Patna (Bihar).
4. Dr. S.N. Sinha, son of not known to the petitioner, The Principal, Patna Medical College Hospital, Patna District- Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Girish Pandey, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. R.B.N. Singh, AC to GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

5 25-08-2018 Learned counsel for the petitioner admits that so far as the monetary benefits are concerned, those have been provided to the petitioner in terms of the order of the learned writ court, however, he has raised a grievance with respect to the date chosen for fixation of his pay on promotion. According to learned counsel even in terms of the notification of the Water Resources Department an option was required to be called for from this petitioner to choose a date in terms of Paragraph-2 of the



Fundamental Rule 22 (i) a (i) as contained in the Department's letter dated 10.04.2013, but the same has not been done despite the representation to that effect submitted by the petitioner. So far as, this aspect of this matter is concerned, it appears that the order passed by the learned writ court does not contain any stipulation in this regard but what has been pointed out by the learned counsel is a matter of record and part of the notification of the Water Resources Department, therefore, this Court does not find any reason not to consider the representation of the petitioner in order to comply the order of the learned writ court in its terms and spirit.

It is expected that the authority concerned shall take a decision on the representation of the petitioner which is enclosed with the contempt application within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

This contempt application stands disposed off with the aforesaid observations.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Ved/-

U			
---	--	--	--

