

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4546 of 2014

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2232 of 2009

=====

Most. Jaitoon,. Wife of Late Halimuddin,. Resident of village - Khaira, P.O.-
Khaira, P.S.- Shahkund, District - Bhagalpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through, Mr. Amarjit Sinha, Principal Secretary Human Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Dr. Birendra Pd. Yadav, District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
3. Jyoti Kumar, The District Superintendent of Education Bhagalpur.
4. Mr. Mundrika Pd. Barnwal the Treasury officer, Bhagalpur.
5. Mr. Sanjay Kumar the State Bank of India Main Branch Bhagalpur, through its Branch Manager.
6. Mrs. Amita Rudra. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Sakhund, Bhagalpur.
7. Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, Accountant General, Bihar, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Pravina Kumari, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar, AC to GA XI

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 03-01-2018

Inter alia, contending that an order passed by this Court on 22.04.2010 in CWJC No. 2232 of 2009 has not been complied with this MJC application has been filed for initiating action for contempt.

The writ petition was disposed of with an innocuous order directing for deciding the representation of the petitioner and settling their claim at an earlier date. From the show cause filed by respondent no. 3 the District Superintendent of Education, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner has been settled, the family pension and other dues



payable have also been paid and now instructions have been issued to the District Treasury Officer, Bhagalpur, as is evident from Annexure-C dated 02.03.2015 for making payment to the petitioner. That being so, once the claim of the petitioner has been settled by deciding the representation, no further indulgence is called for. In case the petitioner has any grievance in respect of the manner in which her representation has been decided it is a case of separate cause of action by the petitioner to challenge it in accordance with law but not a case for initiating action for contempt.

Accordingly, finding no case for initiating any action for contempt, this application stands disposed of with the liberty to the petitioner to challenge the subsequent action in case her grievance still persists.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

mrl/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	04/01/2018
Transmission Date	

