

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.230 of 2024
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16831 of 2022

=====

Tilak Nath Choudhary son of Bhuvneshwar Chaudhary, Resident of Teachers Hostel No.1, Flat No.1, B.U. Campus, Damuchak, Post Office - Head Post Office, P.S. Kazi Mohammadpur, District - Muzaffarpur the retired Junior Engineer (Electrical) B.R.A. Bihar University Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Amir Subhani, son of not known to the petitioner presently posted as the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri K.K. Pathak, son of not known to the petitioner presently posted as the Additional Chief Secretary Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Dr. Rekha Kumari wife of not known to the petitioner presently posted as the Director, Higher Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Prof. Shailendra Kumar Chaturvedi son of not known to the petitioner, presently posted as the Vice Chancellor, B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
5. Dr. Sanjay Kumar son of not known to the petitioner, presently posted as the Registrar, B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
6. Sri Vinod Kumar son of not known to the petitioner, presently posted as the University, Muzaffarpur. Finance Officer, B.R.A. Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the University	:	Mr.Mrigank Mauli, Senior Advocate
		Mr.Indrajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Hitesh Suman, AC to Standing Counsel 13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 02-08-2024 Heard Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, learned counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioner; Mr. Mrigank Mauli

 (learned Senior Advocate) along with Mr. Indrajesh Kumar,

 learned counsel for the University and Mr. Hitesh Suman,



learned AC to SC 13 for the Respondents/Opposite Parties.

2. The show cause filed on behalf of Opposite Party Nos. 4 to 6 in Paragraph Nos. 6, 7 and 8 shows that the representation of the petitioner has been disposed of, vide order dated 30.04.2024 contained in Memo No.B/1156.

3. Considering the fact that the petitioner had sought direction that his representation before the concerned authority is required to be disposed of and his representation having been disposed of, I don't find the same call for any interference. Accordingly, I don't find that any case of the contempt is made out.

4. The petitioner, if so aggrieved, may avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

5. With the above observation/direction, the present MJC application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

chn/-

U			
---	--	--	--

