

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3354 of 2017

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.536 of 1999

=====

Pitambar Chaudhary Son of Late Tarni Prasad Chaudhary, Resident of Chhoti Bhawnathpur, P.O.- Rannuchak Makand Pur, P.S.- Akbar Nagar Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Mr Brijesh Mehrotra, State Of Bihar Through Principal Secretary, Transport Department, Bihar, Patna
2. Mr. Ram Kishore Mishra, B.S.R.T.C. through its Administrator, Pariwahan Bhawan, Birchand Patel Path, Patna
3. Mr. Ram Kishore Mishra, Administrator, B.S.R.T.C., Pariwahan Bhawan, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.
4. Mr. Arbind Kumar Choudhary, Chief Accounts Officer, B.S.R.T.C., Pariwahan Bhawan, Birchand Patel Path, Patna
5. Mr. Choudhary Anant Narayan, The Chief Administrator, Pariwahan Bhawan, Birchand Patel Path, Patna
6. Mr. Choudhary Anant Narayan In-charge, Chief of Operation, B.S.R.T.C., Pariwahan Bhawan, Birchand Patel Path, Patna
7. Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, The Divisional Manager, B.S.R.T.C., Bankipur, Patna Division, Patna.
8. Mr. Ashok Singh, Divisional Manager, B.S.R.T.C., Bhagalpur Division, Bhagalpur.
9. The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the BSRTC	:	Mr. Prabhat Kumar Verma, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh, AC to AAG-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

5 23-04-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
grant of following relief(s):

“against the non-compliance of the



*order dated 22.06.2001 of MJC No.536 of 1999
in CWJC No. 5865 of 1997.”*

3. It has been jointly submitted by Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner as also Mr. P.K. Verma, learned Senior Counsel representing the Bihar State Road Transport Corporation (henceforth for short ‘the Corporation’) that the payments have been made. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the some payments has still awaited.

4. This Court is of the view that MJC No. 536 of 1999 already stands disposed of 22.06.2001. If the petitioner had any grievance, appropriate forum/court was/were available, sixteen years later, another MJC, in the opinion of the Court is impermissible following the Contempt of Courts Act.

5. Once again, it has been reiterated by learned Senior Counsel for ‘the Corporation’ that all admissible dues have been paid.

6. In that background, granting liberty to agitate the matter if still anything remains, the petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

