

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13965 of 2017

=====

Uday Shankar Singh Son of Late Sukhdev Singh, resident of Village-
Hasanpur, P.S. Mahnar, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Food and Consumer Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Vaishali at Hajipur.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Mahnar, District- Vaishali.
7. The Block Development Officer, Mahnar, District- Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravindra Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the State : Mr. U.P. Singh, AC to Sc4

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

2 20-03-2023

1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner by way of this writ petition prays for quashing of order dated 06.02.2017, passed by Justice Uday Sinha Judicial Inquiry Commission, Patna.

3. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had been held guilty and was directed to deposit a sum of Rs. 2,61,670/- of which he has only deposited 1,30,835/- and the remaining Rs. 72,635/- was left. The petitioner challenged the action in the order, whereby he had been held guilty before the



Commission, but the Commission has rejected his case solely on the ground that he has not deposited the amount of Rs.72635/-.

4. I have considered the submission, this Court finds that the order under challenge before this Court is only order of 06.02.2017 which is a consequential order to the order passed earlier by the Commission dated 16.12.2016, whereby the Commission directed the petitioner to deposit Rs. 72635/-. Since the order dated 16.12.2016 is not under challenge before this Court, the consequential order dated 06.12.2017, which has been passed solely on the basis of its earlier order cannot be disturbed. No case for interference is made out.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Pravinkumar/-

Item No. 12

U			
---	--	--	--

