

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3113 of 2017

=====

Rudra Narayan Prasad Singh Son of Late Shivanand Prasad Singh, resident of village - Rampur, P.S. Runi Saidpur, District - Sitamarhi.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Minor Water Resources, Government of Bihar.
3. The Chief Engineer, Minor Water Resources Department, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Minor Irrigation Circle, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bidhanesh Misra, Advocate
For the Accountant General	:	Mr. Vivekanand Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore, A.G.
		Mr. Shailendra Kumar, A.C. to P.A.A.G. 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 24-04-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

2. In terms of the order dated 16.04.2018, the respondent no. 2 is present in Court along with his show cause.

3. Mr. Lalit Kishore, learned Advocate General submitted that the respondent no. 2, because of his requirement to attend an important meeting abroad, was out station but the Additional Secretary of the Department was made Incharge of the office of the Principal Secretary and in fact, the officer, who is present today had specifically endorsed on the file that the Incharge should appear in the case on 16.04.2018, in terms of the earlier



direction of the Court, but due to some issues, the Officer could not be present before the Court when the matter was taken up.

4. Coming on merits, it was submitted that the entire admitted dues of the petitioner have been paid.

5. This fact is not controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Having regard to the aforesaid, the Court finds that there was no deliberate or willful laches on the part of respondent no. 2 to avoid appearing before the Court and accordingly, Rule in the matter of contempt is discharged against him. As the writ petition has served its purpose, the same also stands disposed off.

7. Personal appearance of the respondent no. 2 is dispensed with.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

