

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2002 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9910 of 2016

-
-
1. Sanjay Kumar S/o Late Kali Singh, R/o Village and P.S. Fatehpur, District- Gaya.
 2. Vijay Kumar @ Vijay Yadav, S/o Late Budhan Yadav, Male, aged about 55 years, R/o Village- Madanbigha, P.S.- Fatehpur, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Mr. Chaitanya Prasad, the Principal Secretary Water Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Dinkar, the Engineer in Chief, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Ranjan Kumar, the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Creation, Water Resources, Department, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
4. Mr. Kumar Jayant Prasad, the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Creation, Water Resources Department, Bhagalpur.
5. Mr. Ram Pravesh Singh, the Superintending Engineer, Irrigation Circle, Nawada.
6. Mr. Sudhir Kumar, The Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Sheikhpura.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shiv Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Kinkar Kumar, SC-9

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

9 18-04-2025 Heard Mr. Shiv Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioners and Mr. Kinkar Kumar, learned counsel for the State.

2. The present contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of the order dated 25.01.2024 in C.W.J.C No.9910 of 2016 by which this Court has directed the authority concerned to provide minimum time scale of pay to the petitioners in light of the Bihar State Litigation Policy, 2011 as well as the judgment/order dated 16.12.2004 passed in C.W.J.C



No.9602 of 1999 by which the similarity situated persons have already granted benefit of minimum time scale of pay w.e.f 01.02.1999 and this Court has directed the authority concerned to give the same benefit and arrears of salary also to the petitioners.

3. A show cause, supplementary show cause , second show cause, second supplementary show cause, third show cause has been filed on behalf of the authority concerned in which the authority had already paid the admitted dues to the petitioner but the authority has rejected the claim of the petitioner with respect to DA/ arrears from 01.02.1999 onwards.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that in view of the aforesaid, the present contempt petition may be disposed of with the liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order no.108 dated 21.08.2024 in the appropriate forum by which the authority has rejected the claim of the petitioner with respect to DA/arrears from 01.02.1999 onwards.

5. With the aforesaid liberty, the contempt petition is disposed of.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Suruchi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

