

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6281 of 2020

Dr. Ramapati Sinha, aged about 66 years, Male Son of Late Shyam Narayan Sinha, Resident of Mohalla- Uttrawa Niwas, Ashok Nagar, A.P. Colony, Police Station- Rampur, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Magadh University through its Registrar, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
2. The Vice Chancellor Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
3. The Registrar Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
4. The Finance Officer Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
5. The Head of the Department of Sociology Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Suraj Narain Yadav and Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocates
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

2 22-02-2022 Heard the parties.

The petitioner by way of this writ petition has again come before this Court assailing the amount paid to him as less than what was paid to him. Essentially, it is a dispute relating to the release of arrears and the calculation is disputed by the petitioner.

In this regard, this Court notices that the petitioner had raised the similar issue while the contempt petition was pending before the co-ordinate Bench which decided the writ petition and the co-ordinate Bench vide its order dated



30.01.2019, held as under:

“In this case, show-cause and supplementary show- cause on behalf of opposite party nos. 3 to 6 have been filed and stated that in compliance with order of the writ court, entire payment was already made, however learned counsel for the petitioner raises dispute regarding the calculation. The Court is of the view that in contempt matter, it would be difficult to examine the correctness of calculation.

Prima facie, it appears that the order of the writ court has already been complied with. Accordingly, there is no reason to further keep the matter pending.

The petition stands disposed of.”

Thus, apparently, the Court need not entertain the contention raised by the petitioner nor it allow the petitioner to again file a fresh writ petition.

In view thereof, this writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid observations.

However, it is left open for the petitioner to claim the amount against the respondents by availing remedy under the civil law.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Anand Kr.

U			
---	--	--	--

