

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4154 of 2019
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2826 of 2019

Dr. Pankaj Kumar, S/o Late Aditya Singh, Associate Professor, Department of Physics, Ganga Devi Mahila College, Kankarbagh, Patna- 800020.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Magadh University Bodh Gaya, through it Registrar District- Gaya namely Capt. Jagat Singh Rana.
2. The Vice Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya, namely Prof (Dr) Devi Prasad Tiwary.
3. The Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya, namely Capt. Jagat Singh Rana.
4. The Finance Officer, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya, namely Mr. D.K. Sinha.
5. The Patliputra University, Patna, through it Registrar District- Patna.
6. The Vice Chancellor, Patliputra University, Patna, namely Dr. Gulab Chand Ram Jaiswal.
7. The Registrar Patliputra University, Patna, namely Col. I.A. Khan.
8. The Finance Officer, Patliputra University, Patna namely Mr. A.N. thakur, namely Mr. R.K. Mahajan, IAS.
9. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. R.K. Mahajan, IAS.
10. The Director, Higher Education, Deptt. of Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna, namely Dr. Rekha Kumari.
11. Authorised officer, Pay Verification Cell, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna namely Mr. Manas Milind.
12. The Principal, Tribeni Sayabhama College, Hasua, District- Nawadah, namely Dr. R.S. Jamuar.
13. The Principal, Ganga Devi Mahila College, Kankarbagh, Patna - 800020, namely Dr. Shyama Roy.
14. The Pay-Verification Cell, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, patna through its Authorised Officer, namely Mr. Manas Milind.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Purushottam Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Subhash Chandra Mishra (Sc 16)
For the PPU	:	Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, Advocate
		Ms. Rasika, Advocate
For the MU	:	Md. Faiz Ahmad, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

5 14-07-2025 Heard Mr. Purshottam Kumar Jha, learned counsel for
the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the opposite parties.



2. This contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of order dated 27.06.2019 passed in CWJC No. 2826 of 2019 whereby, the respondents / authorities of the Magadh University were directed to take a decision with regard to entitlement of the petitioner for counting of services of the petitioner and seniority in the light of the recommendation of Justice S.C. Agrawal Commission.

3. Opposite party Nos. 1 to 4 / authorities of the University have filed a show cause.

4. In paragraph No. 4 of the show cause filed it has been stated that in compliance of the order passed in the writ petition, the University has considered the matter and taken a fresh decision in the matter on 02.03.2020, whereby, the Finance Officer of the University vide letter No. Fin-5/112/2020 dated 02.03.2020 has written to the In-Charge Pay Verification Cell, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, whereby, details of the fixation of the pay of the petitioner as per the recommendation of the Justice S.C. Agrawal Commission has been sent. The aforesaid letter dated 02.03.2020 has also been enclosed as Annexure – A to the show cause.

5. On perusal of the averments made in paragraph No. 4 of the show cause filed by the opposite party Nos. 1 to 4 / authorities of the University as well as on perusal of Annexure –



A thereto as highlighted hereinabove, I am of the view that the order passed in the writ petition has been duly complied with by the authorities of the Magadh University / opposite party Nos. 1 to 4, whereby, a decision has been taken fixing the date of the appointment as well as the date of joining of the petitioner as Associate Professor in the Department of Physics and also the pay scale which is stated to be fixed on the basis of the report of the Hon'ble Justice S.C. Agarwal Comission.

6. In that view of the matter, I find that the order passed in the writ petition has been duly complied with by the opposite parties. Contempt application, accordingly, stands closed and disposed off.

7. However, if the petitioner is of the view that there is inaccuracy in the decision taken by the authorities of the University as highlighted hereinabove, he shall be at liberty to agitate the same before the appropriate authority as may be permitted by law.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Siddharth
Sagar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

