

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2100 of 2014

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.63 of 2012

=====

Veena Kumari Daughter Ambika Prasad Resident of Bela Near Shiv Mandir,
Doopula, P.S.- Jakanpur, Patna - 800001

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Dr. R.k. Mittal The Vice Chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, Samastipur and Ors.
2. Dr. M.L. Agrawal, The Registrar, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur
3. Dr. R. Suresh , Teh Officer In-charge, Recruitment, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa District
4. Dr. N.K. Wadhvani, The Director Administration, Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, Bhagalpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

4 23-07-2024 None appears.

2. The present MJC is filed for non-compliance of the order dated 04.04.2012 read with the orders dated 29.02.2012 and 21.03.2012. The present MJC was filed on 12.05.2014. Resultantly, the present MJC is not filed within one year from the date of cause of action accrued to the petitioner. Therefore, the present MJC / contempt application is not maintainable in the light of Section 20 of the contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read



with Article 215 of the Constitution. The Co-ordinate Bench in the case of ***Dr. Rajesh Kr. Sinha and Others vs. Union of India and others*** passed in **MJC No. 1840 of 2023** arising out of **CWJC No. 13808 of 2016** examined the aforementioned provisions in detail.

3. Accordingly, present MJC / contempt application stands dismissed on the ground of limitation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner appraised this Court at 12:20 p.m. that the present MJC has become infructuous. Accordingly, the present MJC stands disposed of as it has become infructuous. It is also submitted that the present MJC / contempt petition is filed against the interim order passed in LPA. During pendency of the present *lis* LPA has been disposed of.

5. In the light of the aforementioned development, whatever interim order granted earlier merges with the final order. Hence, the present petition does not survive for consideration.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

GAURAV S./-

U			
---	--	--	--

