

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.432 of 2018

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16817 of 2013

=====

Jay Kumar S/o Late Baleshwar Sharma, Resident of Village+ P.O. Sarai, P.S. Maner, District Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Pratyamrit (C. M. D.) , The Chairman Bihar State Electricity Board Vidhut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. Sandip Paundrik, The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board Vidhut Bhawan Bailey Road, Patna.
3. Rajendra Pandey, The General Manager-Cum- Chief Engineer, Tirhut Regional Electricity Board, Muzaffarpur
4. Rajendra Pandey, The Electrical Superintending Engineer Electrical Board, Tirhut Circle, Muzaffarpur
5. Rameshwar Singh, The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Hajipur, Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vijay Kr. Verma, Adv.
Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Adv.
N.B.P.D.C. Ltd.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

2 16-01-2019 Heard the parties.

It would appear from perusal of the record that dispute of petitioner and the Electricity Board was settled in Lok Adalat vide award dated 01.05.2010 but the petitioner came before this court and filed C.W.J.C. No. 16817 of 2013 for issuance of direction to the Board for compliance of direction given by the Lok Adalat vide award dated 01.05.2010. However, the aforesaid C.W.J.C. No. 16817 of



2013 was disposed of giving direction to the Board to pass a fresh order and make payment of statutory interest to the petitioner in the light of award passed by the Lok Adalat on 01.05.2010. However, the Board did not comply with the direction given by this court vide order dated 23.01.2014 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 16817 of 2013. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred M.J.C. No. 1964 of 2014 which was disposed of by this court vide order dated 01.04.2015 giving liberty to petitioner to file representation before the Board raising his grievance and quoting relevant provisions and furthermore, the Board/concerned authority was directed to dispose of representation of the petitioner within three months from the date of filing of the representation petition by a reasoned order. However, while disposing of the aforesaid M.J.C. No. 1964 of 2014, this court also granted liberty to petitioner to file a fresh contempt petition, if needed, after disposal of his representation.

Learned counsel appearing for the Board submits that after the order dated 01.04.2015 the Board took matter for consideration and passed a reasoned order on 06.11.2015 which has been annexed with contempt petition



itself. Learned counsel appearing for the Board further submits that Annexure-3 goes to show that the Board has passed reasoned order denying the interest on the pending dues of the petitioner and so far as other dues are concerned, the same have already been paid to the petitioner. He further submits that if the petitioner feels aggrieved by the decision taken by the Board on 06.11.2015, he may file a fresh writ petition and as a matter of fact, now there is no scope to proceed with this contempt petition.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as submissions of the parties, this contempt petition stands dismissed.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

shahzad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

