

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2518 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22343 of 2014

=====

Shahabuddin Ahmad Son of Md. Rassol Resident of Village- Gandhi
Maidan South Side, Siwan P.O.+P.S. and District - Siwan

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Through The Principal Secretary Sri R.k.mahajan Education Department Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. Sri R.K. Mahajan, The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Vikash Bhawan, Patna
3. Jai Prakash University, Chapra, through its Registrar, Mr. R.P. Bablu, District - Chapra
4. The Vice-Chancellor, Sri D.K. Gupta, Jai Prakash University, Chapra
5. Mr. R.P. Bablu, The Registrar, Jai Prakash University, Chapra

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shubh Narain Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ajay Bihari Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

- 8. 23-08-2018** It appears from the show cause filed on behalf of the opposite party Nos. 3 to 5 that after the order was passed by the learned writ court, the said opposite parties have made certain payments after examining the claim of the petitioner but the petitioner is still not satisfied with such payments. The petitioner claims that he has not been paid the entire amount as per his entitlement. On going through the order passed by the learned writ court, this court finds that the writ application was disposed of in terms of the order dated 05.02.2015 passed in CWJC No. 58/2015. When the order was passed in CWJC No. 58/2015 is perused, this



court finds that on the submissions of the petitioner in the said case this court directed the respondent authorities of the J.P. University to examine the claim of the petitioner and the Vice-Chancellor was directed to do the needful and take appropriate decision. This court also observed that whatever amount is found admissible and payable to the petitioner the same shall be paid to him. It is not the case of the petitioner that the admissible amount has not been paid. Petitioner has a grievance over the actual amount paid to him which he claims not in terms of his entitlement.

In the opinion of this court under the given facts and circumstances, no case for initiation of contempt is made out. This application is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to seek his remedy, if so advised, in accordance with law.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

