

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4135 of 2018
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7245 of 2017

=====

Shanker Bhagwan Prasad son of Late Moti Ram, resident of Village- Chandi,
Post- Chandi, P.S.- Garhani, District- Bhojpur Ara. Petitioner/s
Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Its Chief Secretary Government Of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna and Ors
2. Deepak Kumar, Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. Tripurari Sharan, Principal Secretary, Water Recourses Department, Government of Bihar, Sinchai Bha
4. Rajesh Kumar, Engineer-in- Chief-cum- Additional Commissioner-cum-Special Secretary, Flood Control
5. Arun Kumar, Engineer-in- Chief, Headquarter, Water Resource Department, Bihar, Sinchai Bhawan, Patn
6. Rakesh Mohan, Joint Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Sinchai Bhawan, Pat
7. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Joint Secretary Management, Water Recourses Department, Government of Bihar,
8. Jiwanesh Rajak, Deputy Secretary Management, Water Recourses Department, Government of Bihar, Sinc
9. Awadhesh Kumar Mandal, Under Secretary Management, Water Recourses Department, Government of Bihar
10. Sujata Chaturvedi, Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, P
11. Rahul Singh, Secretary Expenditure, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patn
12. Ms. Mani K, Accountant General A and E, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ratnesh Kumar Singh, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Vinay Kriti Singh - Ga 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-09-2021 Heard Mr. Ratnesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel

for the petitioner and Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, GA-2 for the State

through virtual mode.

Learned counsel for the State submits that petitioner
has been paid due salary as per the direction of this Court.
Accordingly, the order has been complied with.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while disposing the writ application, the Hon'ble Court had given liberty to the petitioner to file representation and in pursuance thereof, the petitioner has filed representation claiming the grant of MACP which is still pending for consideration. However, the Respondents have passed order granting MACP to the petitioner but the date of grant of MACP has wrongly been fixed inasmuch as instead of fixing the date for the first MACP on 01.01.2008, it has been fixed on 2016 and for the second MACP, instead of 01.01.2018, the same has been fixed w.e.f 05.09.2018.

Accordingly, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the contempt application with liberty to challenge the order granting MACP to him by way of separate writ application.

Permission is granted.

This contempt application is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez/praful

U			
---	--	--	--

