

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3920 of 2019

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.230 of 2018

=====

Virendra Prasad Thakur, S/o Late Ram Balak Thakur, Resident of Village-
Pirapur, P.S.- Piar, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through R.K. Mahajan, son of not known to the petitioner, the then Principal Secretary, Human Resource Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Ranjit Kumar, Son of not known to the petitioner, the then Director, Secondary and Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Dr. Vimal Thakur, Son of not known to the petitioner, the then District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur.
4. Md. Abdul Salam Ansari, Son of not known to the petitioner, the then District Programme Officer, Muzaffarpur.
5. Dr. Sangita Sinha, Wife of not known to the petitioner, the then District Superintendent of Education, Muzaffarpur.
6. Smt. Rita Kumari, Wife of not known to the petitioner, the then Block Education Officer, Bandara, Muzaffarpur.
7. Smt. Nilam Devi, Wife of not known to the petitioner, the then Head Master, Primary Girls School Rampur Dayal, Bandara, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Bela Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Subhash Chandra Mishra (SC 16)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

5 27-08-2025 This contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of the order dated 16.02.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 230 of 2018, whereby the respondents have been directed to consider the case of the petitioner regarding payment of ACP and MACP.

2. Opposite Party No. 4 has filed the show cause,



wherein, in paragraph No. 5 it has been stated that the petitioner's case for payment of ACP and MACP was considered as per rules and upon such consideration the same was rejected vide Memo No. 1032 dated 27.02.2020.

3. The order dated 27.02.2020 vide Memo No. 1032 passed by the District Programme Officer, Muzaffarpur / Opposite Party No. 4 rejecting the claim of the petitioner as regards the payment of ACP and MACP has also been enclosed as Annexure A to the show cause filed by the Opposite Party No. 4.

4. Since the direction passed in the writ petition was for a consideration by the Opposite Party No. 4 as regards the entitlement of the petitioner for payment of ACP and MACP, I find that the same has been complied with by the Opposite Party No. 4.

5. Accordingly, the contempt petition stands closed and disposed of.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Narendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

