

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1335 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14827 of 2017

=====

Bhuneshwar Singh, Son of Late Ramdhari Singh, Resident of Village- Karup,
P.O.- Malwar, P.S.- Sheosagar, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Mr. Amir Subhani, the Principal Secretary,
Department of Home (Police), Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Anand Kishore, The Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
3. Mr. Animesh Kumar Parasar, The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Parth Sarthi, GA-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2018 Heard.

The present miscellaneous jurisdiction application has been filed for initiating a contempt proceeding against the Opposite Parties for willful violation and disobedience of the order dated 16.11.2017, passed in CWJC No. 14827 of 2017.

The factual matrix of the case is that the petitioner preferred CWJC No. 14827 of 2017 for a direction to the respondent authorities, particularly, Opposite Party No.3, the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram to take a decision on the application of the petitioner submitted for grant of arms licence of NP Bore rifle. The writ application was disposed of vide order dated 16.11.2017 with a direction to the Opposite Party No.3, the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram to dispose of



the application of the petitioner in view of the up-to-date police report as well as the direction of the Home (Police) Department, Government of Bihar, as contained in Annexure-8, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

It is submitted by learned counsel for Opposite Parties that the Opposite Party No.3, the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram has rejected the application of the petitioner vide order dated 03.08.2018, passed in Case No.22 of 2018.

Though the order was not passed within the prescribed period of six weeks, but keeping in view the fact that the said time limit was not very specific in the order itself and order of this Court has substantially been complied, hence, this Court is not inclined to proceed further with the matter.

Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

However, the petitioner will be at liberty to challenge the order of the District Magistrate in appeal.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

