

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1766 of 2025**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12395 of 2023**

=====

Bhupendra Nath Singh, Son of Late Keshav Prasad Singh, Resident of Keshav Bhavan, Gali No.- 2, Maharaja Hata, Arrah, P.S.- Nawada, District-Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Mr. Bibek Agrawal, Son of not known Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, Mr. S. Sidharth, Son of Not Known, Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Government of Bihar.
3. Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, through the Registrar Mrs. Rubi Kumari, Daughter of Not Known, Registrar, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara Nalanda.
4. Vice- Chancellor, Prof. Sidharth Singh, Son of not Known, Vice Chancellor, Nava Nalanda Mahavihar, Nalanda.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dr. Ratan Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.S.C. Mishra, SC 16

For the UOI : Mrs. Kanak Verma, Advocate

For the O.P. Nos. 3 and 4: Mr.Ajay Kumar Sinha, Sr. Advocate  
Mr.Ugranath Mallik, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      12-09-2025                      The petitioner and the opposite parties are represented by their learned counsels.

2. The instant contempt application has been filed for a direction upon the Opposite Parties to comply with the order passed by this court in C.W.J.C. No. 12395 of 2023



on 27<sup>th</sup> of February, 2025.

3. By virtue of the aforesaid order, this Court directed the respondents / Opposite Parties to treat the writ petition as representation of the petitioner and dispose of the same by a reasoned order within a period of 60 days from the date of communication / receipt of the same.

4. The Opposite Parties has filed an explanation showing cause on 21<sup>st</sup> of August, 2025, on perusal of which it appears that the petitioner's case was duly considered by a Three Member Committee and the Committee made their recommendation before the Vice Chancellor, Nav Nalanda Mahavira, Nalanda. Thereafter, by a reasoned and speaking order, dated 16<sup>th</sup> of June, 2025, the Vice Chancellor rejected the representation of the petitioner, holding, inter alia, that the representation of the petitioner is devoid of any merit.

5. In the light of the order passed in the writ petition, this Court finds that the petitioner is not entitled to get any relief in the instant contempt application.

6. If the petitioner is aggrieved, he has liberty to file fresh writ petition.

7. The contempt application stands disposed of,



accordingly.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J)

uttam/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

