

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.678 of 2018

Mumukshu Kumar Choudhary Son of Late Jagidsh Choudhary, Resident of Village P.O.-Palatpura, P.S.-Manpur, District-Nalanda at Biharsharif, Presently Posted as Sub-Divisional Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Bikramganj, Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Urban Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Madhubani.
5. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Madhubani.
6. The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bikramganj, District-Rohtas.
8. The Treasury Officer, Sasaram, District-Rohtas.
9. State Information Commission, Bihar, Patna through its Secretary, 4th Floor, Suchna Bhawan, Bailey
10. The Secretary, State Information Commission, 4th floor, Suchna Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
11. The Under Secretary, State Information Commission, 4th Floor, Suchna Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
12. The Section Officer, State Information Commission, 4th Floor, Suchna Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Mritunjay Kumar,Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar, AC to GP-4
For the Respondent No.9 to 12	:	Mrs.Binita Singh,Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

4 20-09-2022 Though the present writ petition has been filed challenging the order dated 11.05.2015 passed by the State Information Commission in Case No.85706 of 2012-13, nonetheless, it is the case of the petitioner that the said order dated 11.05.2015, has been passed behind the back of the petitioner, inasmuch as he had demitted the office of the



Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Madhubani on 08.05.2014, however, it has been admitted by the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner that during the interregnum period, the petitioner has deposited the cost of Rs.10,000/-.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court had made a suggestion to the learned counsel for the petitioner that in case the matter in question is set at rest at this juncture by holding that the order dated 11.05.2015, would not be considered to be a punitive action against the petitioner, whether the petitioner would be satisfied, to which the answer of the learned counsel for the petitioner is in the affirmative.

In such view of the matter, the present writ petition stands disposed off with a direction to the State Information Commission to set at rest, the matter in question, at this juncture, as it is, however, it is directed that the said order dated 11.05.2015, passed by the State Information Officer, shall not be considered to be punitive in nature and shall also not cause any prejudice to the petitioner in his future pursuits.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

S.Sb/Sonal-

U			
---	--	--	--

