

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15114 of 2009

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14009 of 2006

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18793 of 2008

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.683 of 2007

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s



with
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2179 of 2014
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9725 of 2011

Prabin Chandra Singh

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar and Ors

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 1969 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sarvesh Kumar Singh, (AAG-13)
Mr.Rajat Kumar Tiwary, (AC to AAG-13)

(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2068 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajatshatru, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pandey S Sahay, Advocate

(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2177 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Roy Shivaji Nath, Advocate

(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2178 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sarvesh Kumar Singh, (AAG-13)
Mr.Rajat Kumar Tiwary, (AC to AAG-13)

(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2179 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sarvesh Kumar Singh, (AAG-13)

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

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

17 10-04-2024

M.J.C. No. 2177 of 2014

Despite our earlier order in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014,
the concerned respondents have not complied.

2. For non compliance of previous order dated
13.03.2024 passed in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, respondents
are liable to pay cost of Rs. 25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousands



Rupees) for the reasons that the present M.J.C. No. 2177 of 2014 is pending for consideration for the last one decade.

3. Re- list this matter for further orders on 26.04.2024.

M.J.C. No. 2178 of 2014

4. Despite our earlier order in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, the concerned respondents have not complied.

5. For non compliance of previous order dated 13.03.2024 passed in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, respondents are liable to pay cost of Rs. 25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousands Rupees) for the reasons that the present M.J.C. No. 2178 of 2014 is pending for consideration for the last one decade.

6. Re- list this matter for further orders on 26.04.2024.

M.J.C. No. 2179 of 2014

7. Despite our earlier order in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, the concerned respondents have not complied.

8. For non compliance of previous order dated 13.03.2024 passed in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, respondents are liable to pay cost of Rs. 25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousands Rupees) for the reasons that the present M.J.C. No. 2179 of 2014 is pending for consideration for the last one decade.

9. Re- list this matter for further orders on 26.04.2024.

-



M.J.C. No. 2068 of 2014

10. Despite our earlier order in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, the concerned respondents have not complied.

11. For non compliance of previous order dated 13.03.2024 passed in M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014, respondents are liable to pay cost of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousands Rupees) for the reasons that the present M.J.C. No. 2068 of 2014 is pending for consideration for the last one decade.

12. Re- list this matter for further orders on 26.04.2024.

M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014 and M.J.C. No. 2178 of 2014

13. Second Supplementary Show Cause on behalf of Opposite Party No. 3 is filed. In Para No. 6 and 9, it is stated as under:-

“6. That at the outset, it is most humbly submitted that the cost as imposed by this Hon’ble Court has already been paid to the petitioners is as follows:-

<i>Petitioner’s Name</i>	<i>Cost Amount</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Sri Subhash Chandra Singh</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Karunesh Kumar</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Ravi Ranjan</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Sarad Kumar Sinha</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Arun Kumar Jha</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Triloki Nath</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Sarwar Akram Khan</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Shayama Nandan Mishra</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Prabin Chandra Singh</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>
<i>Sri Jogendra Prasad</i>	<i>5000/-</i>	<i>Paid</i>



9. That apart from above, it is most humbly submitted that the differential amount consequent to merger in BES/A.C.P.-M.A.C.P. have already been extended to Sri Subhash Chandra Singh (Petitioner), Sri Karunesh Kumar (Petitioner) and Sri Ravi Ranjan (Petitioner) which is being shown in tabular form for its perusal:-

(a)

Petitioner Name	Differential amount	Status
Sri Subhash Chandra Singh	1927500/-	Paid
Sri Karunesh Kumar	2661424/-	Paid
Sri Ravi Ranjan	2496825/-	Paid

14. That apart learned counsel for the Respondent furnished payment made to the petitioners – Sri Subhash Chandra Singh and Sri Ravi Ranjan on 08.04.2024.

15. In view of these facts and circumstances, the present M.J.C. No. 1969 of 2014 and M.J.C. No. 2178 of 2014 stands dropped.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

alok/manish-

U			
---	--	--	--

