

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1534 of 2018

- =====
1. Ramesh Chandra Sinha, Son of Late Radhiak Raman Prasad Sinha, resident of Village+ Post+ Police Station- Sanjhouli, District- Rohtas, at present resident of Flat No. B-7, Moon City, Dimna Road, Mango, Jamshedpur.
 2. Mukesh Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Radhiak Raman Prasad Sinha, resident of Village+ Post+ Police Station- Sanjhouli, District- Rohtas, at present resident of Flat No. A/1, Lakkhan Residency, RPS More, Opposite Sudha Dairy, Bailey Road, Patna.
 3. Diwesh Chandra Sinha, Son of Late Radhiak Raman Prasad Sinha, resident of Village+ Post+ Police Station- Sanjhouli, District- Rohtas, at present resident of O/35, Ashiyana Nagar, Phase- 1, Patna.
 4. Bijesh Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Radhiak Raman Prasad Sinha, resident of Village+ Post+ Police Station- Sanjhouli, District- Rohtas, at present resident of Flat No. D-008, Kanchangiri, Ashiyana Enclave, Dimna Road, Mango, Jamshedpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Judge, Sasaram at Rohtas
2. Secretary, Permanent Lok Adalat, Sasaram at Rohtas.
3. Sri Kameshwar Lal, S/o Late Kailash Lal, resident of Village- Mathurapur, Post- Barki Mahuli, P.S.- Karhara, District- Rohtas at present working as Peon, S.P. Jain College, Sasaram, District- Rohtas.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogendra Mishra
Mr. Arvind Kumar Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Munkeshwar Tiwari, AC to AAG-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

3 05-09-2018 Heard Mr. Yogendra Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners.

This petition is filed for initiation of contempt proceeding against Opposite Party No. 1 to 3 particularly Opposite Party No. 3 for deliberately violating the order dated 17.01.2018 passed by this Court in Civil Misc. No. 761 of 2017.



The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that some rights has been created in favour of the respondents by the order contained in Annexure-6 but operation of the order (Annexure-6) has been stayed. It appears that, of course, operation of Annexure-6 is stayed but the respondents are not refrained from making any construction over the disputed land. Thus, I find that Opposite Party No. 1 to 3 have not violated any order of this Court making them liable for initiation of contempt proceeding.

In this view of the fact this contempt proceeding is dismissed.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

BKS/Rajan

U			
---	--	--	--

