

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI.
Cont. Case (C) No. 826 of 2015**

Urmila Singh Petitioner

-V e r s u s-

- 1.The State of Jharkhand;
- 2.Mrs. Rajbala Verma, The Principal Secretary, P.W.D. [Public Works Department], Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi;
- 3.Sri Mast Ram Mina, The Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi;
- 4.Smt. Kumud Sahay, The Deputy Secretary, Chatra

... Opposite Parties

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAMATH PATNAIK.

For the Petitioner : - Mr. Sachin Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party-State : - Mr. Amit Kumar, A.C. to G.P. II.

16/12.12.2018 Heard Mr. Sachin Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Mr. Amit Kumar, learned A.C. to G.P. II appearing for the Opposite Party-State.

The aforesaid contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of the order dated 19.01.2015, passed in W.P. (S) No.4833 of 2014.

Supplementary show cause affidavit dated 05.12.2018 has been filed by the Opposite Party No. 3, stating that reasoned order dated 21.06.2016 has been passed by the parent department of the petitioner vide Annexure-A to the said affidavit. So far as payment of salary for the period in question is concerned, the same has already been regularized vide Annexure-B to the said affidavit. However, a sum of Rs.3,31,160/- has been paid to the petitioner as a difference on account of unutilized leave salary vide Annexure-C series. With regard to grant of 1st and 2nd A.C.P. and 3rd M.A.C.P., since the petitioner is entitled to get arrears to the tune of Rs.21,57,104/-, accordingly, the same has been paid by the two Bank Drafts bearing Demand Draft No.171370, dated 08.11.2018 and the Demand Draft bearing No.171369, dated 08.11.2018, as evident from Annexure-D series to the said affidavit.

On perusal of the assertions made in the Supplementary show cause affidavit dated 05.12.2018, it appears that the order dated 19.01.2015, passed in W.P. (S) No.4833 of 2014 has been complied with.

If any of the claim is still payable to the petitioner, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the appropriate Forum for redressal of her grievances.

Accordingly, the contempt proceeding is dropped, with the liberty, as aforesaid.

(Pramath Patnaik, J.)

APK