

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1959 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6387 of 2014

=====

Kumari Rampyari, D/O Sri Jagdish Sah, R/O Village - Milki, P.O. Lalganj,
P.S. K. Hat, District - Purnia.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Mr. R. K. Mahajan, the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Ram Chandradoo, the Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Mithilesh Kumar, the District Education Officer, Purnia.
4. Mr. Nageshwar Mandal, the Block Education Officer, Barhara Kothi, District- Purnea.
5. Mr. Chandradeo Prasad Rai, the Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Sukhsena, Block- Barahara Kothi, District-Purnia.
6. Mr. Surendra Prasad, the Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Sukhsena, Block- Barhara Kothi, District – Purnia.
7. Mr. Ramchandra Kumar Sah, the Head Master, Primary School, Sabhagachhi, Block - Barhara Kothi, District – Purnia.
8. Shiv Narayan Mandal, S/O Late Mangal Mandal, Resident of Village- Kailu Tol, Sukhsena, Block and P.S.- Barhara Kothi, District - Purnia.
9. Santosh Kumar, S/O Shri Sumarit Thakur, resident of village - Gulela Bitta, Block and P.S. Barhara Kothi, District - Purnia.
10. Pawan Kumar Thakur, son of Shri Sumarit Thakur, resident of Village - Gulela Bitta, Block and P.S. Barhara Kothi, District - Purnia.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, AAG- 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 06-03-2019 It is drawing strength from the directions present in the judgment and order passed in CWJC No.13835 of 2012, whereby past back wages were allowed to such of the teachers who had continued on their respective posts and discharged their



duties but were not being paid their salary that the present contempt application is filed raising a grievance regarding non-payment of salary.

When the matter is taken up, on query made learned counsel for the petitioner admits that the service of petitioner was terminated and she has given her joining consequent upon the judgment of this Court but in the interregnum period she did not discharge any duty.

In such view of the matter, the order of this Court allowing the salary to those who were in continuous discharge of duties would not extend to the petitioner for drawing past benefits. No case of contempt is made out.

The contempt application is accordingly disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Anjula/skpathak

U			
---	--	--	--

