

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.535 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12735 of 2013

=====

Anil Kumar Singh, Son of Late Tej Narayan Singh, Resident of Village-Benaut, P.O. Saraon, P.S. Rasulpur, District Saran at Chhapra, presently posted as Estimator, Central Circle, Road Construction Department, Chhajugbag, Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Anjani Kumar Singh, son of not known, Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri Pankaj Kumar, son of not known, the Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri Laxmi Narayan Das, son of not known, the Engineer in Chief-cum-Additional Secretary -cum- Special Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Sri Bhawani Nandan, son of not known, the Chief Engineer, South Bihar (Traffic) Sub Wing, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. Sri Krishna Chand Mishra, son of not known, the Chief Engineer, (Traffic)-cum- Conducting Officer, North Bihar Sub Wing, Road Construction Department, C.D.O. Building, Bishweshwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. Sri Krishna Murari, son of not known, the Superintending Engineer, Central Road Circle, Road Construction Department, Bihar, Patna.
7. Sri Umesh Kumar Ray, son of not known, the Executive Engineer, New Capital Road Division, Road Construction Department, Patna.
8. Sri Uttam Kumar, son of not known, the Assistant Engineer, New Capital Road Sub Division No. 2, Road Construction Department, Patna.

... .. Opposite parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Bhan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. R B P Yadav - AAG-11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 12-12-2018 Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out

that in compliance of the judgement and order dated 19.08.2016

passed in C.W.J.C. No.12735 of 2013, the authority has passed



two orders; first order dated 24.09.2018, is in favour of the petitioner but by the second order dated 08.11.2018 the authority has rejected the claim of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the opposite parties have taken a very splitted stand, contradicting to each other. But, the question in the present case is that whether this Court should exercise the power under contempt proceeding and punish the opposite parties. This Court has already given direction for passing reasoned order, in such circumstance, it will not be desirable and proper to initiate the contempt proceeding against the opposite parties.

In such view of the matter, this contempt petition is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order of the respondent authority, by which his claim has been rejected, before the appropriate Court/ Authority / Forum.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

