

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1386 of 2018

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.2293 of 2016

=====

Pradip Kumar @ Pradip Ram, Son of Bhim Ram, Resident of Villaghe/
Mohalla-Sonhan, P.S.-Sonhan, District-Kaimur (Bhabhua).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anjani Kumar Singh Son of not Known to the Petitioner, Chief secretary,
Old Secretariat, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Amir Subhani, Son of not Known to the Petitioner, Principal Secretary,
Home (Police) Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. K. S. Dwivedi, Son of Not Known to the Petitioner, Director General of
Police, Bihar, Patna.
5. Mannu Maharaj Son of not Known to the Petitioner, Senior Superintendant
of Police, Patna.
6. Mrs. Harjeet Kaur, Son of not Known to the Petitioner, Superintendent of
Police, Kaimur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 20-04-2023

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The appointment of the petitioner in the

District Police Force was set aside by the Senior

Superintendent of Police, Patna on the ground of his

alleged involvement in a criminal case.



3. The learned single Judge hearing the writ petition bearing No. 3313 of 2014, *vide* judgment dated 23.11.2016, set aside such order of dismissal and directed the authorities to reinstate the petitioner with 50% back wages.

4. The petitioner preferred an appeal against the afore-noted judgment of the learned single Judge *vide* L.P.A. No. 2293 of 2016, wherein the judgment of the learned single Judge was modified to the extent that the respondents were directed to pay 100% back wages to the petitioner.

5. From the show cause reply filed on behalf of the opposite party No. 5, it appears that initially 50% back wages was given to the petitioner, whereafter rest 50% was also given to him.

6. It has also been stated in the show cause reply that this contempt petition was filed before the order passed in the Letters Patent Appeal had been complied with.



7. In that view of the matter, nothing remains
for us to keep this contempt petition pending and thus it
is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/Praveen

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	25.04.2023
Transmission Date	

