

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.101 of 2026

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17429 of 2015

=====

Jay Kumar @ Jai Kumar Son of Late Dukh Haran Prasad, Resident of
Mohalla- Madhubani, Chunapur Police Station- K.Hat, District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through P.M.G.
2. Ms. Vndita Kumari, Secretary, Department of Posts Dak Bhawan.
3. Sri Anil Kumar, Chief Post Master General, Bihar Circle, Patna.
4. Sri Pankaj Kumar, Director Accounts (Postal), Patna G.P.O. Complex, Patna.
5. Sri Parimal Sinha, Post Master General Northern Region, Muzaffarpur.
6. Sri Parimal Sinha, Director of Postal Services (N), C/o Post Master General,
Northern Region, Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
7. Sri Arvind Kumar Singh, Superintendent of Post Office, Purnea Division,
Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
For the Union of India	:	Mr. Praveen Kumar Sinha, Sr. Panel Counsel Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANJAN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

6 30-06-2026 The present application has been preferred by the

petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated

02.08.2016 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in

CWJC No. 17429 of 2015.

2. A show cause has been filed on behalf of opposite
parties, wherein following statements have been made in
paragraph No. 5:



"That in absolute and strict compliance with the observations and directions of this Hon'ble Court, the matter was processed through the competent administrative channels. After careful evaluation of the entire inquiry record, gravity of charges, and representations, the final punishment order has been formally passed and issued by the competent authority."

3. Considering the statements as referred above, this court is of the view that no further order is required to be passed in the present matter as the order under contempt has already been complied with.

4. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

5. If so advised, the petitioner, if aggrieved by the decision of the authority concerned, shall be at liberty to challenge the same by way of filing an appropriate application in accordance with law.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Ranjan Kumar Jha, J)

rishabh/rajesh

U			
---	--	--	--

