

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3782 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9890 of 2013

-
-
1. Rajeev Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Shambhu Sharan Prasad, Resident of Mohalla- Alkapur, P.S.-Gardanibagh, P.O.- Anisabad, District- Patna.
 2. Vinod Kumar Tiwari, son of Late Surendra Nath Tiwari, Resident of Village- Mauri, P.S.- Paliganj, District- Patna.
 3. Pushyakar Kumar, son of Late Biranchi Singh, Resident of Village- Kobil, P.S.- Islampur, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Its Chief Secretary Namely Anjani Kumar Singh
2. Aamir Subhani, the Home Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri P. K. Thakur, Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
4. Sri S. K. Singhal, the Additional Director General of Police (HQ), Bihar, Patna
5. Preeta Verma, the Additional Director General of Police, Wireless and Technical Service, Bihar, Patna
6. Sri Krishna Murari Sinha, the Superintendent of Police (Wireless), Bihar, Patna.
7. Sri Tarkeshwar Prasad, the Joint Director, Home (Police) Department, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Janmejay Giridhar, Advocate
		Mr. Vipin Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma, AC to AAG- 3

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 08-09-2023 Heard Mr. Janmejay Giridhar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma, learned counsel for the State.

2. Mr. Sharma, learned counsel for the State, by referring to the statements made in the show-cause filed on behalf of opposite party nos. 5 and 6, submits that pursuant to the order of this Court, the petitioners have been given notional promotion. However, on account of lack of adequate vacancy,



the actual promotion could not be made.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the order of this Court has not been complied with in its letter and spirit and, moreover, as per the Government resolution, the petitioners were required to provide opportunity of two promotions in the service period, but the same has not been done and, as such, the order passed by the opposite party no.5 is in defiance of the order passed by the Court.

4. Having considered the submissions and from the record, prima facie, it appears that in compliance of the order of this Court, the claim of the petitioners was duly considered and the same has been disposed of by a reasoned and speaking order, the present contempt petition stands disposed of.

5. However, the petitioners are at liberty to assail the order, if the grievances of the petitioners are still subsist.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--

