

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.814 of 2018

Arising out of

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2366 of 2014

=====

Shakuntala Devi, wife of Late Shyama Nand Lal Dutt, resident of village-
Pratappur, PO- Muktapur, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri C. Suresh Kumar, Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri R. K. Mahajan, Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Sri R. S. Chaugathu, Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Sri Sujata Chaturvedi, Finance Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. Sri Sushil Kumar, Director Administration, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
7. Sri Dev Kumar Paswan, District Education Officer, Samatipur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dipak Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, AC to AAG-15
For the A G	:	Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan, SC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 04-11-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AC to AAG-15 for the State and learned counsel for the Accountant General, Bihar.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court alleging non-compliance of order dated 30.01.2016 passed in CWJC No.2366 of 2014.

3. The same reads as under:



“Let the petitioner file a fresh representation before the competent authority with regard to her grievance. The same will be looked into in its entirety and a decision will be taken within a period of four months from the date of filing of such an application.

Writ application is disposed of with above observation.”

4. From the pleadings on record, it transpires that the petitioner has filed representation before the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar. On a query by the Court to learned counsel for the petitioner as to who is the competent authority, he submitted that it was the District Education Officer, Madhubani.

5. In view thereof, the petitioner not having filed application before the competent authority, there cannot be any question of violation of order of the writ Court.

6. Accordingly, the Court finds no occasion to interfere in the matter in its contempt jurisdiction.

7. The application stands disposed off.

8. However, it shall be open to the petitioner to file a fresh representation in terms of the order of the writ Court before the competent authority who, as has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner, is the District Education Officer, Madhubani. Upon such representation being filed, it



shall be ensured that the order of the writ Court is complied with.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

J. Alam/-

AFR/NAFR	
U	

