

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3069 of 2017

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.609 of 2016

=====

Birchandra Singh Son of Late Deo Narain Singh, resident of Village- Matia,
P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Govt. Of Bihar, New Secretariat Building, Bailey Road, Patna, namely, Shri R.K. Mahajan.
2. Shri R.K. Mahajan, the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department now Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat Building, Bailey Road, Patna
3. Mr. Brajesh Kumar Ojha, the Regional Deputy Director of Education Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
4. Mr. Lalan Prasad Singh, the District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur.
5. Mr. Md. Mustafa Hussain Mansuri, the District Program Officer Establishment, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey - AAG- 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 07-01-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

The instant petition has been filed for initiation of
contempt of court proceeding against the erring opposite
parties for their wilful and deliberate disobedience of the order
of this Court dated 03.07.2017 passed by a Division Bench of
this Court in L.P.A. No. 609 of 2016 whereby and whereunder



this Court while disposing of the aforesaid Letters Patent Appeal has been pleased to direct the petitioner to submit detailed claim with regard to the amounts payable to the petitioner after settlement of his claim with a direction to the respondents to settle the claim of the petitioner within one month after withholding 10% of the pension pending finalization of the criminal case and after considering the same to pass a speaking order within 30 days with further direction that if any amount of the claim of the petitioner still subsists the petitioner may challenge the same in accordance with law with further saying that the amount settled and directed to be paid to the petitioner, if already not paid, should be released and paid to the petitioner within a period of 30 days.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition reserving liberty to approach the authorities concerned highlighting the manner in which the directions contained in the judgment under contempt have yet not been complied with.

Permission granted.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn with the liberty aforesaid.

Equally, liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach



this Court again on the same and subsequent cause, if need so
arises.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

P.K.P./-

U			
---	--	--	--

