

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1761 of 2022

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9943 of 2020

=====

Ranjeeta Verma Wife of Chandan Kumar Mehta Resident of Mohalla-
Baburbanna, P.S.- Rahui, District- Nalanda, Sohsarai at Nalanda, Proprietor of
Elit Garden Restorent.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Shri Shashank Shubhankar, D.M. Nalanda, Biharsharif.
2. Shri Avdhesh Kumar, The District Election Officer, Nalanda, Biharsharif.
3. Director D.R.D.A. Nalanda.
4. Chief Election Officer, Nalanda.
5. The Dy. Election Officer, Nalanda.
6. The Nazir of Election Officer Nalanda.
7. The Nazir of Bhuarjan Dept. Nalanda.
8. The Treasury Officer, Nalanda.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anil Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA-7
		Mr. Mr. Ajeet Kumar, AC to GA-7

=====

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

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

3 07-03-2024 The present MJC/ contempt petition is filed for non

compliance of order dated 17.12.2021 passed in CWJC No.

9943 of 2020.

2. It is relevant to reproduce extract of the order and it

reads as under:-

Considering the facts and



circumstances, this writ application is disposed of at this stage itself with a direction to the District Magistrate, Nalanda to take a final decision on the petitioner's claim for payments against the bills submitted by her within two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

It goes without saying that the amount, which is found admissible, must be paid to the petitioner forthwith. The petitioner shall, however, be at liberty to raise dispute before appropriate forum, if, according to her, the amount found admissible by the District Magistrate is less than her actual entitlement.

3. The official respondents have not made any application for extension of time and in the absence of seeking such time, they have committed contempt of court. No doubt, there is a belated compliance on 13.02.2023.

4. Be that as it may, there is enormous delay in compliance. Hence, present petition is to be disposed of with cost of Rs. 5,000/- (rupees five thousand only). Cost shall be paid to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner disputed compliance to the extent that petitioner is entitled to more than what has been paid to her by virtue of order dated 13.02.2023, if



it is so, she has to make necessary representation or application with any material information to the extent that she is entitled to more than what has been paid to her. If such application or representation supported by documents are furnished to the concerned respondent, the concerned respondent is hereby directed to take note of and redress the same at the earliest and communicate the decision whether petitioner is entitled to what has been claimed or not. If the petitioner is not satisfied, in that event, she is at liberty to invoke remedy before appropriate forum.

6. With the above observation, the present MJC/contempt petition stands dropped.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

