

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1185 of 2018

In

Letters Patent Appeal No.756 of 2016

=====

Keshav Prasad Son of Bhubaneshwar Prasad, Resident of Near Isolation Ward
Quarter, Hospital Road, Mayaganj, P.S.-Mayaga District-Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mr. Daya Nidhi Pandey, The Secretary, Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Chanchal Kumar, The Secretary, Building Construction Development, Bihar, Patna.
4. Mr. Upendra Narayan, The Chief Manager, South Part, Building Construction Department, Bihar, Patna.
5. Mr. Adarsh Titarmare, the District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
6. Mr. Anand Sharma, The Deputy Development Commissioner, Bhagalpur.
7. Mr. Sudhanshu Shekhar Rai, The Superintending Engineer, Building Circle, Bhagalpur.
8. Mr. Ram Agya Kumar, the Executive Engineer, Building Division, Bhagalpur.
9. Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma The District Eelfare Officer, Bhagalpur.
10. Mr. Dudhnath Ram, the District Planning Officer, Bhagalpur
11. Mr. Ibrar Alam, The Deputy Collector, Establishment, Bhagalpur Collectorate, Bhagalpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhoy Kumar Kashyap, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Adv.

=====



CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

4 20-04-2023 Heard Mr. Abhoy Kumar Kashyap, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Prabhat Kumar for the State.

Vide judgment dated 30.11.2017 passed in L.P.A. No. 756 of 2016, the respondent authorities were directed to dispose off the representation of the petitioner by an order which would be communicated to the petitioner within a period of three months. Further direction was that if at all any compensation was liable to be paid to the petitioner, the same should also be paid to him within a period of one month.

The learned counsel for the State points out that pursuant to the afore-noted judgment of the Division Bench, the representation of the petitioner has already been disposed off.



In case the petitioner is not satisfied with the order passed by the concerned authority, he would have the liberty to challenge the same before an appropriate authority but, as of now, there is no necessity of continuing with the contempt petition, which is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/Praveen

U			
---	--	--	--

