

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1987 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3375 of 2014

=====

Ravi Ranjan, son of Rameshwar Rai, Resident of village- Kedalpura, P.O. and P.S.- Akilpur, District- Patna, the Secretary of Lok Jagran Seva Sansthan, Office situated at village- Sikandarpur, P.O.- Chandmari, P.S.-Shahpur, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar Through Sri Awdhesh Ram, At Present Posted As Director, District Rural Developme

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Dayal Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar - Aag 4, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 25-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

The present contempt application has been filed alleging violation of order dated 20.09.2016 in C.W.J.C. No. 3375 of 2014.

The learned counsel for the State, at the outset, submits that the order has been complied and it is next submitted that from perusal of the penultimate paragraph at Page-3 of the order of which violation is being alleged, it would manifest that the Court has recorded – In the circumstances, I am not inclined to invoke the extraordinary and discretionary writ jurisdiction of the Court and grant relief leaving the



petitioner to agitate its claim before the authority as indicated in the order dated 22.02.2014. The learned counsel for the State thus submits that no positive direction was given, nor the Court was inclined to entertain the writ application on merits rather merely disposed of the writ application with an observation that in case the petitioner files any application the same shall receive due consideration. The learned counsel thus submits that when no mandamus was issued by this Court directing any particular authority to consider the representation of the petitioner then contempt cannot be alleged.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt the Court did not issue a writ of mandamus, but then there was an observation to consider the representation of the petitioner if any, it is next submitted that the authority who had earlier adjudicated the claim, the matter was again sent before him and thereafter again he came to a conclusion that no payment is due to the petitioner. On this the learned counsel for the State submits that, in the event, if the petitioner is aggrieved by an order passed by D.D.C. who adjudicated the claim he has remedy available in law.

Considering the submissions made by the learned State counsel, the court is not inclined to entertain the contempt



application.

The contempt application is dismissed.

However, the petitioner would at liberty to challenge
the order by which he is aggrieved.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

shivam/-

U			
---	--	--	--

