

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1685 of 2019

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10175 of 2014

=====

Sikandar Prasad Yadav S/o Sri Ghanshyam Yadav Resident of Village-
Dumma, P.S.- Bihra, District- Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna Sri Deepak Kumar S/o not known, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. Sri Amir Subhani, S/o not known, The Additional Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. Sri Asangwa Chuwa Aao S/o not known, The Divisional Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
4. Srimati Shailja Sharma, W/o not known, The District Magistrate, Saharsa.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Verma (AAG3)

Mrs. Divya Verma (AC to AAG3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 19-06-2026

None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
State is present.

3. From the order dated 12.02.2026, it would transpire
that on the said date also none had appeared on behalf of the
petitioner and the learned Co-ordinate Bench in paragraph no. 2
had recorded the following:-

*“2. Learned counsel for the State by
referring to para-21 of the show-cause
submits that the order passed in this case
has already been complied with and the
statements so made is being reproduced
herein below:-*

*“21. That with respect to the
contents of para 18 of M.J.C. it is
stated that 12504 of 2007 Para-18 the*



Order of the Hon'ble Court dated 27-07-2017 passed in C.W.J.C. No (Yogendra Yadav versus the State of Bihar and Others) has been complied by the opposite parties in the meeting dated 23-02-2019 of the District Selection Committee (Class-IV), Saharsa with its proceedings issued vide memo no. 343/est..date 23.02.2019."

4. After recording the above, an opportunity was granted to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner to file rejoinder to rebut the claim of the state, however, even today none appears for the petitioner. From the show cause filed on behalf of the State, especially paragraph no. 21, it would transpire that the order under contempt has already been complied and this Court is satisfied that no contempt is made out.

5. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

Krishnakant/
Kunal

U			
---	--	--	--

