

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1376 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16809 of 2019

=====

Rajendra Nath Barman, Son of Late S.C. Barman, Resident of Mohalla Durga
Asthan, Colony No. 1, P.S. Katihar, District Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Deepak Kumar, Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. Dr. Rekha Kumari, The Director, Higher Education, Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri Ram Pravesh Singh, The Incharge Officer Pay Verification Cell, Department of Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. The B.N. Mandal University, through its Registrar Dr. Mihir Thakur.
5. Dr. R. N. Yadav, The Vice Chancellor, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.
6. Dr. Mihir Thakur, The Registrar, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.
7. Mr. N.K. Snha, The Financial Advisor, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.
8. The Purnea University, Purnea through its Registrar Mr. Ghanshyam Roy.
9. Mr. R.K.P. Raman, The Vice Chancellor, Purnea University, Purnea.
10. Mr. Ghanshyam Roy, The Registrar, Purnea University, Purnea.
11. Sri Indra Kumar The Finance Officer, Purnea University, Purnea.
12. Sri Dilip Jha, The Proctor Cum- Conducting Officer, Purnea University, Purnea.
13. Dr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, The Principal, M.J.M., Mahila College, Katihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shanti Pratap, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Madan Jeet Kumar, GP-20
For the Purnea University	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Samrendra, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 07-11-2025

Heard the parties.

2. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Samrendra, learned Advocate
for the Purnea University has apprised this Court that in
compliance with the order of this Court, the petitioner has been



extended all the benefits in the admissible pay-scale as has been fixed by the Pay Verification Cell constituted by the State Government.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted at the Bar that the pay-scale fixed by the Statutory Committee of the University has been modified unilaterally by the Pay Verification Cell of the State and thus the petitioner has been paid reduced amount and for which he seeks liberty to challenge the certificate of the Pay Verification Cell of the State.

4. Considering the submissions aforesaid and taking note of the fact that the substantive amount as directed by this Court has already been paid to the petitioner, there is no reason or occasion to continue with the present contempt petition. Accordingly, the contempt petition stands closed.

5. However, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the certificate issued by the Pay Verification Cell of the State, if he feels aggrieved.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

