

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.593 of 2019

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21464 of 2014

-
-
1. Kameshwar Singh and ors Son of Late Jamindar Singh, resident of Village Bajitpur, Police Station Sanjhauli, District Rohtas at Sasram, President, District- Labour Union (Forest), Rohtas.
 2. Sudarshan Paswan, Son of Bhuneshwari Paswan, resident of Village Mahuwari, Police Station Nokha, Bagaula, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
 3. Vijay Ram, Son of Somaru Ram, resident of Village Samari, Police Station Shiv Sagar District Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar and Ors through the Principal Secretary, Shri Tripurari Saran, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Shri Tripurari Saran, Son of name not known, Principal Secretary, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Shri Rajesh Jha, Son of name not known, Joint Secretary, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Shri Ekendra Kumar Ghask, Son of name not known the Deputy Secretary, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Shri S.K. Shukla, Son of name not known, the Principal chief Conservator of Forest, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. Shri Shri D.K. Shukla, son of name not Known, the Regional Chief Conservator of Forest, Environment and Forest Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
7. Shri N.K. Chaudhary, son of name not known, the District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabua.
8. Shri Pankaj Dixit, Son of name not known, the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.
9. Shri S. Goswami, Son of name not known, District Fisheries Officer, Rohtas Forest Division, Sasaram.
10. Shri Satyajeet Singh, Son of name not Known, the District Forest Officer, Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Punam Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh (AAG-13)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER



6 16-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the State submits that the necessary orders in terms of the direction issued by this Court has been passed and nothing survives for adjudication.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that claim of the petitioner has been rejected, therefore, liberty may be restored to challenge the same.

4. Accordingly, the contempt petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to take such remedy appropriate in law.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

U			
---	--	--	--

