

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3211 of 2023

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1425 of 2015

=====

Sulekha Kumari W/o Santosh Kumar Prabhakar, Resident of Village-
Kiratpur, Rajaram, P.O and P.S.- Bhagwanpur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Prem Singh Meena, the Principal Secretary, Social and Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. Kaushal Kushore, the Director, I.C.D.S., Social and Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. Girish Chandra Pandey, the Deputy Director, Welfare, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
5. Gopal Meena, the Commissioner, Tirhut Pramandal, Muzaffarpur.
6. Yaspal Meena, the District Magistrate, Vaishali.
7. Lalita Kumari, the District Programme Officer, Vaishali.
8. Basu Shree, the Child Development Project Officer, Patepur, Block Patepur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satya Prakash Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, 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 20-04-2024 The present MJC / contempt application is filed for

non-compliance of the order dated 18.09.2017 in the year 2023.

There is a delay in filing the present contempt application and it

is in violation of Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act,

1971. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Dr.**



Rajesh Kumar Sinha and Ors. vs. The Union of India and Ors. (MJC No. 1840 of 2023 decided on 24.07.2023)
examined Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution.

2. Accordingly, the present contempt application is not maintainable. Hence, present contempt application stands disposed of reserving liberty to the petitioner to invoke remedy under writ jurisdiction.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in the year 2023 certain compliance have been made and it is not full-compliance. In such circumstances, petitioner is at liberty to question the partial complied order in a writ jurisdiction or in accordance with law.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

GAURAV S./-

U			
---	--	--	--

