

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2337 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4162 of 2016

=====

Jainendra Kumar S/o Ram Nath Paswan, Resident of Village and Post-Nagwan, P.S.- Naubatpur, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Ashwani Lohani, The Chairman, Indian Railway Board, New Delhi.
2. Ranjan Prakash Thakur, Son of not known, The Divisional Railway Manager, Eastern Central Railway, Danapur.
3. Ravish Kumar, Son of not known, The Additional Divisional Railway Manager, Eastern Central Railway, Danapur.
4. A. Haq, Son of not known, The Senior Divisional Finance Manager, Eastern Central Railway, Danapur.
5. Md. Astar Ali, Son of not known, The Senior Divisional Engineer 3, Eastern Central Railway, Danapur.
6. Hans Raj Meena, Son of not known, The Assistant Divisional Engineer, Eastern, Central Railway, Buxar
7. Vishnu Shankar Singh, Son of not known, The Senior Section Engineer, Railway, Buxar.
8. M.S. Sharma, Son of not known, The Senior Section Engineer, Railway, Dildarnagar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rikesh Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 08-09-2023

Heard the parties.

2. The present contempt application has been filed for willful disobedience of the order dated 17.04.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 4162 of 2016, whereby considering the nature of the grievance of the petitioner and with consent of the parties, a



liberty was granted to the petitioner to approach opposite party/respondent no.3, Additional Divisional Railway Manager, Eastern Central Railway, Danapur, with a fresh representation for redressal of his grievance.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite specific direction of this Court to consider the claim of the petitioner in right perspective, the same has not been considered in its letter and spirit and vide order dated 21/22.05.2018, the claim of the petitioner has been rejected.

4. Learned counsel for the Railways submits that a show-cause has already been filed by the opposite parties and referring to the averments made therein, he submits that the representation of the petitioner was duly considered and the claim of the petitioner has been rejected by a reasoned and speaking order, the copy of which has been brought on record by way of Annexure-B to the show-cause.

5. Considering the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking note of the fact that in compliance of the order of this Court, the concerned opposite party has already passed the reasoned and speaking order, the present contempt application has manifestly lost its purpose and thus, it is disposed of.



6. It is needless to observe that the petitioner shall be at liberty to assail the order dated 21/22.05.2018, if he feels so aggrieved.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11-09-2023
Transmission Date	

