

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4061 of 2019**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.450 of 2003**

=====

Ramjanam Singh S/o Late Khobhari Singh Resident of Lodi Katra, Patna  
City, P.O.- Jahuganj, P.S.- Khajekalan, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Industrial Development Commissioner,  
Industry Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Bihar State Credit and Investment Corporation Ltd. (BICICO) through  
its Managing Director namely Ravindra Prasad, Indira Bhavan, 4th Floor,  
Ram Charitra Singh Path, Boring Canal Road, Patna
3. Ravindra Prasad, The Managing Director, Bihar State Credit and Investment  
Corporation Ltd. (BICICO) Indira Bhavan, 4th Floor, Ram Charitra Singh  
Path, Boring Canal Road, Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                    |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Amaresh Kumar Sinha, Adv.      |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sinha AC to AAG-7 |
| For the BICICO       | : | Mr. Kumar Ravish, Adv.             |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      02-08-2023                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
  
counsel for the opposite parties/contemnors and learned counsel  
  
for the Bihar State Credit and Investment Corporation Ltd. (for  
  
short 'BICICO').

2. The present contempt application has been filed on  
  
behalf of the petitioner for initiation of a contempt proceeding  
  
against the contemnors/opposite parties, for willful and  
  
deliberate disobedience of the order dated 06-02-2018, passed in  
  
C.W.J.C. No 450 of 2003.



3. The dues, pursuant to the court's direction in CWJC No. 450 of 2003, stands substantially complied. This aspect of the matter is not in dispute. Having fairly submitted so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to some inadvertent submissions recorded in the court's order passed in CWJC No 450 of 2003, the entire dues, as per petitioner's entitlement, could not flow to the petitioner. Such shortfall since apparently based on the petitioner's own error of inadvertence, the Court does not find any grounds for proceeding further in contempt.

4. The contempt petition is dismissed.

5. The petitioner would be at liberty to avail other remedies in accordance with law.

**(Madhuresh Prasad, J)**

shyambihari/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

