

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3248 of 2017

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.65 of 2017

=====

Anju Kumari Daughter of Basudeo Lal Sah, Resident of Village - Milki,
Police Station - Bihpur, District - Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sri R.K. Mahajan, Son of not known presently posted as the Principal Secretary, Health Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Dr. R.D. Ranjan, Son of not known presently posted as the Director-in-Chief, Health Services, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Dr. Azad Hind Prasad, Son of Not known, presently posted as Director, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Shri Om Prakash Prasad, Son of not known, presently posted as the Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Bhagalpur Division, Bhagalpur.
6. Sri Aadesh Titarmare, Son of not known presently posted as the District Magistrate, Bhagalpur, District- Bhagalpur.
7. Dr. Bijay Kumar, Son of name not Known, presently posted as the Civil Surgeon- cum-Chief Medical Officer, Bhagalpur.
8. Dr. Ramchandra Prasad, Son of not known, presently posted as the Additional Chief Medical Officer ACOMO Bhagalpur.
9. Dr. Manoj Choudhary, Son of not known, presently posted as the District Immunization Officer, Bhagalpur.
10. Dr. Arun Kumar Sinha, Son of not known, presently posted as The In-Charge Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Jagdishpur, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Diwakar Yadav, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. S. D. Yadav, AAG 9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 27-03-2019 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

By the order passed on the writ petition, the order of

transfer together with the penalty order was quashed. The writ

petition was allowed with consequential reliefs.



It is complaining the non grant of consequential reliefs that the petitioner for the 2nd time has moved in contempt. The show cause filed reflects that the claim of the petitioner for salary has been rejected by the opposite party no. 7 vide order dated 22.2.2019 on grounds of unauthorized absence. According to Mr. Diwakar Yadav this is contempt. Learned counsel for the State submits that the order disposes the claim towards consequential reliefs on merits.

I am in agreement with the submission of learned State counsel for the disposal of the claim, even if not to the satisfaction of this petitioner, is not contempt. However, in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the order, she would be at liberty to challenge the same before the appropriate forum by filing appropriate application.

No case for contempt is made out. The contempt application is accordingly disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Bibhash

U			
---	--	--	--

