

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3561 of 2008**

=====

Rajesh Maskara, son of Sri Hari Shankar Maskara, Director, H.I. Dairy and agro products Ltd., resident of Lata Kunj West Boring Canal Road, Patna.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Navin Kumar Finance Commissioner Government of Bihar Patna.
3. A.K. Sinha Principal Secretary Department of Industries Government of Bihar Patna.
4. Sri Pran Mohan Thakur Director Industries cum member secretary State level capital subsidy committee department of industries government of Bihar Patna.
5. Sri Pran Mohan Thakur Managing Director Bihar State Credit and investment corporation Indira Bhawan Patna.

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                    |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Binoda Nand Mishra             |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, AC to SC-6 |
| For the BICICO       | : | Mr. Nirmal Kumar                   |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

20    03-10-2018

In view of the statements made in paragraph 9 of the show cause saying that a sum of Rs.5,42,100/- has been paid to the petitioner vide Cheque bearing no.731609 dated 25.09.2018, this Court is of the opinion that the contempt proceeding need not go on.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not satisfied with the amount sent to the petitioner, therefore liberty should be granted to the petitioner to claim other and further amount to which the petitioner may be entitled to.

In the opinion of this Court, it will be a matter of



accounting between the parties. The Court leaves it open for the petitioner to come out with claim, if he is of the opinion that some amount remains to be paid to him. Since the learned Writ Court has not decided on the entitlement of the petitioner, at this stage, in the contempt jurisdiction, the Court would not do that. The petitioner will be at liberty to raise his claims and follow it in accordance with law in an appropriate jurisdiction.

The application stands disposed off, accordingly.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

Arvind/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

