

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1493 of 2023

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14285 of 2019

=====

Ramashish Prasad Son of Sidheshwar Prasad, Resident of Village- Khirauna,
P.S.- Rahui, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Mr Kriti Kiran the Secretary Bihar State Power Holding Company Ltd
Vidyut Bhawan, Patna.
2. Sri Sanjeev Hans the Managing Director, South Bihar Power Distribution
Company Ltd, Patna.
3. Sri Vikas Kumar the Executive Engineer, power Supply Division South
Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif.
4. Sri Rajeev Ranjan the Assistant Engineer, Power Supply Sub Division, Bihar
Sharif, Nalanda.
5. Sri Taranjot Singh the Commissioner, Bihar Sharif Municipal Corporation,
Nalanda at Bihar Sharif.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Sanjay Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate
	Mr.Vijay Kumar Verma, Advocate
	Mr.Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 25-09-2023

The petitioner is concerned with the order dated
12.12.2022, passed by a Division Bench of this Court and
alleges contempt. In fact, the specific contention was with
respect to drawing of an electric open wire over the residential
land of the petitioner. After hearing of the matter, the petitioner



himself sought permission to withdraw the petition reserving liberty to take recourse to such other remedies. Court only directed the appropriate authority to consider and decide the petitioner’s application expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the date of its presentation. The order had been passed which is produced at Annexure-A of the show cause filed.

2. The petitioner has raised the contentions on merits before us, which cannot be entertained. The directions issued in the judgment were complied with and we find no deliberate contempt. However, the petitioner if concerned with the order passed could always challenge it.

3. Reserving such liberty, the contempt case is closed.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Anushka/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	30.09.2023
Transmission Date	

