

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.287 of 2022

=====

Vivekanand Sharma Son of Late Modnarayan Sharma Resident of Mohalla-Satsang Nagar, Road, No.1, Lane No.2, Jehanabad, Police Station-Jehanabad, in the District of Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India.
2. Shri Giridhar Aramane, the Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highway, Transport Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. Shri T.T. Negi, The Chief Engineer (P-3), Ministry of Road Transport and Highway, New Delhi.
4. Shri R.N. Singh, the Secretary, Ministry of Railway, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
5. Shri Vinay Kumar Tripathi, the Chairman, Railway Board, Railway Bhawan, New Delhi.
6. Shri Himandari Maharana, the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Railway, Government of India, New Delhi.
7. Shri Naresh Salecha, the Financial Advisor, Railway Board, New Delhi.
8. Shri Prabhat Kumar, the Divisional Railway Manager, (East Central Railway) Danapur Division, Patna, Bihar.
9. Shri Amir Subhani, the State of Bihar through the Chief Secreary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
10. Shri Amir Subhani, the Chief Secreary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
11. The Pratyaya Amrit, The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
12. Anil Kumar Sinha, the Chief Enginer, Road Construction and Highway, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGC
For the State	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar, AC to AAG-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)



3 20-07-2023

The present petition is filed for non-compliance of the order dated 18.02.2020 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 16196 of 2017.

2. Pursuant to the order, the petitioner has submitted his representation on 26.05.2020 and it was considered and rejected on 15.06.2020.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondents have admitted that the petitioner is entitled. At the same time, they have failed to consider the grievance of the petitioner. These are all on merit, the same cannot be adjudicated in a contempt proceedings. The scope of contempt petition is limited to the extent what is the direction/order and further whether such direction/order has been complied by the concerned respondent or not.

4. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner had submitted representation on 26.05.2020 and it was decided on 15.06.2020. Therefore, the present contempt petition stands dropped, reserving liberty to the petitioner to invoke appropriate remedy, if he is still aggrieved by the action of the respondent.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

U			
---	--	--	--

