

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1596 of 2018

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1583 of 2011

-
-
1. Dr. Ram Binod Prasad Singh Son of late Ram Lakhan Singh
Resident of Village-Bakhtiyarpur, P.S. Bakhtiyarpur, District-
Patna, At Presently 51, Marwari Awash Grih, Frazer Road, Patna.
 2. Dr. Subhash Kumar Singh Son of late Ram Gulam Singh
Resident of Ajanta Niketan, Dr. Prabhunath Singh Path, Keshri
Nagar, Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Mr. R. K. Mahajan, The Principal Secretary,
Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. Mr. Manoj Kumar, the Secretary, Human Resource Development Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. J. Prasad, the Joint Secretary, Human Resource Development Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Md. Kahalid Mirza, the Director, Higher Education Department, Government
of Bihar, Patna.
5. Mr. P.C. Singh, The Special Secretary, Human Resource Development
Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. Dr. Kamar Hasan, the Vice Chancellor Magadha University, Bodh Gaya,
District- Gaya.
7. Dr. M.K. Shastri , the Registrar, Magadha University, Bodh Gaya, District-
Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey (Aag 15)

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 22-06-2018

Seeking initiation for action for violation of an order
dated 13.11.2013 passed in MJC No. 1583 of 2011 this application



has been filed. However, it is seen from the records that this Court in MJC No. 678 of 2013 and various other cases has already considered the issue by a detailed order passed on 19.09.2017 in MJC No. 2640 of 2017 has refused to exercise jurisdiction in a contempt proceeding and granted liberty to the petitioners to challenge the action of the University afresh in accordance with law.

Inter alia, contending that while passing the order on 19.09.2017 in contempt case MJC No. 2640 of 2017, certain benefits granted to similarly situated employees and the action of the University and the State Government in violating the litigation policy and denying similar benefits to the petitioners has not been taken note of.

This is a contempt proceeding and as indicated hereinabove, already this Court has disposed of identical contempt matters in the case of the present applicants themselves and has granted them liberty to initiate proceeding afresh in accordance with law. Once in an earlier contempt proceeding this Court has refused to interfere and has granted liberty to the petitioners, I see no reason to proceed further in the matter. The petitioners may take recourse to such remedy as may be available in law in case



they still have any grievance. No case is made out to take action
for initiating the proceeding for contempt.

The matter stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

mrl./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	25.06.2018
Transmission Date	

