

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 3635 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17162 of 2016

Uma Shankar Singh S/o Ram Briksha Singh Resident of Village and P.O.-
Harpur Belwa, P.S.- Mahua, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Dr. N Saravana Kumar, the Secretary Food and Consumer Protection Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Jaspal Mina, the District Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.
3. Ms. Apurva Tripathi, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Mahua, Vaishali.
4. Mr. Arun Kumar, the District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Vaishali at Hajipur.
5. Ms. Ranjana Krishnan, the Assistant Account Officer, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Vaishali at Hajipur.
6. Mr. Purshottam Narayan, the Assistant Godown Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Mahua, Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satya Prakash Sinha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Standing Counsel 4
Mr. Shailendra Kr. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Utkarsh Utpal, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

ORAL ORDER

- 3 21-11-2025 **1.** The present M.J.C. No. 3635 of 2024 has been filed for initiation of contempt proceedings against respondents as they have deliberately disobeyed the order of this Court.
- 2.** A detailed counter affidavit was filed by the Opposite Party Nos. 4 and 5. The counter



affidavit disclose that, in compliance with the order of this Court, the respondents have deposited an amount of Rs. 98,916/- through Real Time Gross Settlement (RTGS) in the bank account of the petitioner on 30.06.2025. and prayed to drop the proceedings.

3. This Court while disposing of the Writ petition No. 17162 of 2016 directed the petitioner to make a proper representation before the respondent No. 4, along with all relevant documents and in turn, the respondent shall pass an appropriate order within a period of four weeks from the date of filing of the representation, in accordance with law with respect to petitioner's claim for return of money.

4. Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned counsel for the respondents.

5. It is specific contention of the Learned counsel for the petitioner that an amount of Rs. 1,97,832/- has to be deposited by the respondents. However, an amount of Rs. 98,916/- was only



deposited as an admitted amount and the balance amount was not deposited.

6. It is noted that, in compliance with the order of this Court, the respondents came to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled only to (admitted amount) Rs. 98,916/- and the same was duly deposited. If at all the petitioner is aggrieved by the orders of the respondents, he has to challenge the same.

7. With the said observations, the contempt proceeding is hereby closed.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Manish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

