

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1754 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18206 of 2013

=====

Ratneshwari Devi, W/o Late Uma Charan Das, resident of Village- Kasmar
Road, Peterbar, P.O.P.S.- Peterbar, District- Bokaro, Jharkhand.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sri Arun Kumar Singh, presently posted as Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar Patna
3. Sri Gajanan Mishra, presently posted as Additional Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Kumar Jayant Prasad, presently posted as Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Siwan.
5. Sri Rama Shankar Dwivedi, presently posted as Superintending Engineer, Saran Canal Anchal, Gandak Project, Siwan
6. Ashok Kumar, presently posted as Executive Engineer, Saran Canal Division, Gandak Project, Siwan.
7. Sri S.Suresh Kumar, Accountant General (A & E), Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Bhushan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar - AAG 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 13-03-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

In the present case, the petitioner is seeking initiation
of contempt proceeding on account of non-implementation of
the order dated 22.08.2016 passed in CWJC No. 18206 of 2013,
the operative portion of the order is as follows:

*“In such circumstances, this Court directs
the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner as*



juniors of her husband have been granted benefit from earlier date and as such petitioner should also be given the same benefit from the date the juniors to her husband have been given. But this will not be treated to be precedent. Let the respondents must take decision within a period of six months.”

The Authority has already taken a decision with regard to grant of ACP and MACP and the benefit in the shape of difference of salary has been paid, but now the claim has been made that the arrears of pension and the family pension which comes to Rs. 7,00,000/- having not paid.

In such circumstances, the claim, which has been made by the petitioner, cannot be entertained in the present proceeding of contempt.

Accordingly, this petition is dropped.

However, the petitioner, if so advised, may take proper recourse for the payment of arrears of pension and family pension.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

V.K.Pandey/
S. Katyayan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

