
(2001) 10 PAT CK 0048
In the Patna High Court
Case No : M.A. No. 458 of 2001

Sri. A.K. Upadhyay

APPELLANT

Vs

Smt. Chintamani Sinha and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-10-2001

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2001) 10 PAT CK 0048

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Ravi S. Dhavan, C.J.—This appeal under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 has, been filed against an order dated 24 September, 2001, a proceeding in civil contempt, numbered as MJC. No. 2240 of 1999: Smt. Chintamani Sinha v. State of Bihar and Ors. On 16 July, 2001, the array of parties was permitted to be amended. The Appellant had been added as an opposite party No. 7, Sri. A.K. Upadhyay, Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna. Thus, initially, the Appellant was not a party to the cause. By this order, the Petitioner Smt. Chintamani Sinha also received an order of the Court that she may file a fresh representation before the Com-missioner-cum-Secretary of the department and the latter may have the opportunity to consider the claim and pass a reasoned order. The representation was permitted to be filed within a week. Thereafter, Com-missioner-cum-Secretary of the Road Construction Department was given time to act on the representation within three weeks. Thus, it is on record that the Commis-sioner-cum-Secretary of the Road Construction Department, who happens to be the Appellant comes into the picture on the order dated 16 July 2001.

2. The record will need to be explained on the controversies. The Petitioner's husband, the late Bal Mukund Sinha, died on 29.4.1998. He had joined service as an Assistant Engineer in October 1973 in the Advance Planning Division of the Rural Engineering Organisation at Hazaribagh. After his death his widow sought the emoluments due to her husband as a consequence of the State services rendered. The following claims were made upon the department:

(1) Earned leave from 10 July 1987 to 23 August 1987, (2) compulsory waiting period as duty from 14 August 1987 to 10 July 1988, (3) regularisation for period of compulsory waiting for 172 days, (4) arrears of salary, between February 1994 until his death on 29 April 1998, (5) time bound promotion after completing 10 years of service as an Assistant Engineer on the basis of a notification No. 946 dated 26.2.1990 in the old scale of pay of Rs. 1350-50-1700-75-2000/- effective from 23 June 1986, and (6) demand of a form to fill and apply for receiving the pensionary dues, family pension and other pensionary benefits such as group insurance, general provident fund, leave encashment and arrears of pay.

3. Finding that the post retirement benefits due to her husband and her widow's pension were not being paid she filed a writ petition, CWJC. No. 9237 of 1998: Smt. Chintamani Sinha v. State of Bihar. On the petition the following order was passed:

15.1.1999. Petitioner has approached this Court for issuing a writ of mandamus commanding the Respondents to pay her arrears of salary and retiral benefits of her deceased husband.

Heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the record.

From paragraph 8 of the writ petition, I find that the Petitioner has made a representation to the Respondent No. 1 on 11.8.1998 for the redress of her grievance and as such, I am not inclined to interfere under Article 226 of the Constitution at this stage. In my view, it will subserve the interest of justice if the Respondent No. 1 is directed to decide the pending representation of the Petitioner expeditiously.

I, accordingly, dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the Respondent No. 1, the Commissioner and Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, to decide the pending representation of the Petitioner in accordance with law by a speaking order within three months from the date of production of a certified copy of this order on him. The claim of the Petitioner for arrears of salary will also be considered within the same period. The amount found due to the Petitioner will be paid to her within one month from the date of disposal of her representation, with statutory interest.

4. It needs to be mentioned that at the time when this order was passed the State of Bihar and the Respondents arrayed in the writ petition had not received an opportunity to reply to the petition. This aspect may not be so relevant in so far as the Court had directed the Respondents to make arrangements for the payment of the post retirement dues of the Petitioner's husband and the family pension, due to her. The order was passed at the stage of admission of the writ petition and the petition was disposed of with the order dated 15.1.1999. But, the aspect of an opportunity to the State Respondents will become relevant, if ultimately contempt proceedings were to be considered and consequently a stage was about to arise that there may be a conviction of one of the Respondents particularly the one recently arrayed as late as on 16 July 2001. Admittedly, the

Respondents had been arrayed as a party ex-officio at the crime when the writ petition had been filed. When the contempt application had been filed the personnel changed. When the Appellant was added as Respondent No. 7 he was being lined up as a contemnor.

5. In so far as the state of the record is concerned, even Sri. S.A. Narain, Senior Advocate, acknowledged that the whole episode was a shabby situation that a widow of a government employee who died during service had been left all these times without her husband's service dues now being paid to her and her right to be delivered with widow's pension, also in arrears. Senior counsel appearing for the Appellant also acknowledges that the state of affairs is correct that unless the post retirement benefits are chased they normally do not come to government servants upon their retirement and that this widow was facing such a situation.

6. After the court had passed its order on 15 January 1999 disposing of the writ petition at the admission stage two of the Respondents, that is, Director Provident Fund, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, and the District Provident Fund Officer Khagaria filed a miscellaneous application (MJC. No. 1839 of 1999: The District Provident Fund Officer v. Smt. Chintamani Sinha) praying that the time awarded by the Court on 15 July 1999 be extended by two months for the implementation of the order for payment of general provided fund. Thus, it may be understood that the time was extended as from the date of the order dated 21 July 1999 by another two months. Nothing turns on this either except that the Respondents were conscious that post retirement benefits due to the Petitioner were in the stage of being processed. The order passed on the miscellaneous application seeking extension of time is reproduced below:

21.7.1999. The application has been preferred by opposite party for extension of time of further two months for compliance of order dated 15 January 99 passed in CWJC. No. 9237 of 1998. After filing of the said application about two months have passed.

In the aforesaid circumstances, I extend the period for implementation of order of payment of GPF by another two months. The order dated 15 January 1999 stand modified to that extent.

The MJC application stands disposed of.

7. Finding that the post retirement benefits of her husband and the family pension due to her was still not forthcoming despite the fact that the time had been extended, the Petitioner invoked two proceedings before the High Court. One is relevant for the contempt application and the other is not relevant. The one which is not relevant is a LPA. No. 206 of 1999 filed by the Petitioner on 17 February 1999. What is not relevant is the contents of the letters patent appeal. It carried the following order:

4.11.1999. Heard the parties.

This appeal has been preferred against the order passed by the learned single judge whereby the Petitioner has been permitted to file a representation before the concerned authority for redressal of her grievance.

We do not find any error in the order passed by the learned single judge. Therefore, it is not possible to grant any relief to the Appellant in this appeal, which is, accordingly dismissed.

8. From the order it appears that the Petitioner was not satisfied that she had been required to make a representation before the authority concerned to seek the post retirement benefits and the family pension. The letters patent appeal was dismissed. It is not understood why the Petitioner filed the letters patent appeal. It is explained by the counsel who appeared on behalf of the Respondent (that is the Petitioner) that she was, in fact, looking for penal interest @ 18% on the delay on payment of post retirement benefits and pension and arrears of salary. This admission apparently did not cut much ice with the division bench. It declined to interfere the letters patent appeal with the order passed on the writ petition, dated 15 January 1999.

9. Now the contempt application: This contempt application had been filed while the letters patent appeal of the Petitioner had been pending. The letters patent appeal had been filed on 17 February 1999. The contempt application MJC No. 2240 of 1999 was filed on 29 July 1999. It was taken up for the first time on 16 July 2001. It was listed for the first time on 28 March 2001. The registry, had pointed out that the case was not defect free. There is an order in the resume of proceedings, dated 28.3.2001 which grants time for removing the defects indicated by the registry. The same order records that a counter affidavit has been filed. Notice had not been issued on the contempt application but a counter affidavit was filed on behalf of one of the Respondents, though verified on 14 December 1999. The deponent in this counter affidavit describes himself the opposite party No. 3. Opposite party No. 3 happens to be one Arun Kumar Singh, Accountant General (A and E) (II) Bihar, Patna. The deponent of the counter affidavit is one Khalid Bin Jamal. This counter affidavit suggests that a pay in slip in favour of the Petitioner's husband had been issued representing arrears of pay. The pay in slip is dated 6 August 1999. Why make out a pay-slip in the name of a dead person. The Petitioner's husband had died on 29.4.1998. It further mentions that leave encashment has not been authorised for want of sanction of unutilised earned leave but 240 days of unutilised earned leave to the credit of the deceased officer has been reported. The counter affidavit also states that family pension and gratuity have been authorised by an order dated 19 March 1999 under PPO No. 84075. For statutory interest it is mentioned that sanction order in respect of such payment has been called by memo dated 12 August 1999. This only gives an impression that papers were being processed and further that a pension payment order had been identified.

10. A pension payment order is only made when a government servant retires, dies or a family pension is to be awarded to the rightful claimant. The next

counter affidavit, also filed before the issue of notice, is on behalf of opposite party Nos. 1 and 2. It has been affirmed by one Ashok Kr. Verma describing himself as a Joint Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna and opposite party No. 2 Ram Dayal Sinha, the Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Additional Secretary-cum-Special Secretary, Road Construction Department, Patna. Opposite Party No. 2 U.K. Sinha did not file a counter affidavit. This counter affidavit only mentions that 90% of the Petitioner's family pension and gratuity had been sanctioned vide memo No. 1208 (S) by order of 16 February 1999 in favour of the widow Smt. Chintamani Sinha. In the counter affidavit it is stated that subsequently 10% of the family pension and gratuity has also been sanctioned vide memo No. 2351 (S) dated 1 April 1999 and that full family pension and full gratuity of the Petitioner have been sanctioned and communicated to the Accountant General, Bihar. Regarding general provident fund the counter affidavit acknowledges that an advance certificate has been issued to the District Provident Fund Officer, Bhagalpur. It is stated that it is upto the District Provident Fund Officer, Bhagalpur to reply on this matter. This is an unusual submission in a contempt proceeding. It is stated that unutilised earned leave encashment has also been sanctioned by the department vide memo No. 7804 (S) dated 6.9.1994. Regarding group insurance it is mentioned that the Petitioner's husband had not applied at the headquarters but on the office of the Superintending Engineer, Ganga Bridge Project, Bhagalpur, and that the latter has been directed to sanction the group insurance dues forthwith or if there is any difficulty then return her application to the head office. This is red-tape, as all are offices of the State administration, and the strangeness between the offices mentioned is not so much as chalk and cheese. This counter affidavit mentions that a copy of this memo had been endorsed to the Petitioner "but she kept quite mum and did not cooperating department (sic). "What can the Petitioner say if file pushing is going on between government departments.

11. This deponent mentions on behalf of Respondent No. 2 (U.K. Sinha, the Commissioner and Secretary, Road Construction Department) who has not filed an affidavit himself that there was no intention to violate the order of the Court. This is a contempt proceeding and answerability cannot be delegated nor deputed. This U.K. Sinha, the Commissioner and Secretary, Road Construction Department, was aware that he was answerable but was not taking the responsibility in filing his affidavit. This is disrespect to the Court. Then there is an affidavit filed by the Under Secretary, Finance, Personnel Claim Cell, opposite party No. 5 Sri. Stefen Lucas. His answer is cryptic. He mentions that the papers have been sent to the Accountant General, Bihar and that he has not violated any order of the High Court.

12. Three counters to which the Court has referred to as filed on 4.11.1999, 23.12.1999 and 28.8.2001 were prior to the issue of the notice. On 11 July 2001 the Petitioner Smt. Chintamani Sinha was filing a reply to the show cause filed by the Respondent No. 5. She contends that those who were responsible never filed their affidavits but sent their deputies to do so. This part of the grievance is

valid. Then, she acknowledges that in so far as the pension and gratuity is concerned she has received payment but belatedly after much harassment. She submits that she is entitled to statutory interest. She contends that the provident fund dues for the period 1 March 1983 to 9 July 1987 while her husband was posted at Bausi at Bhagalpur have not been paid. She further submits that the exercise of gathering and furnishing details between departments is still going and as of date, that is, 11 July 2001, the general provident fund amount of the deducted salary is not forthcoming. So far as the leave encashment is concerned she says that she has been paid less by Rs. 15080/-. In so far as the group insurance is concerned she mentions she has been paid only Rs. 17820/- whereas she is entitled to amount of Rs. 100020/-. She points out errors in reckoning the dues. Her husband had contributed a sum of Rs. 4680/- from his salary as group insurance and the plea taken by opposite party that her husband made no contribution is incorrect. She further mentions that whereas her husband would have been entitled to Rs. 5,57,245.85 but as against this she has been paid only Rs. 2,01,245.85 and that an amount of Rs. 3,56,022.85 is still due. She mentions that she sent an application to the Accountant General (A and E) (II) by a letter dated 29 May 2001 but she has received no response. She contends that her representation has not been considered and monies as of right as post retirement benefits of her husband and her widow's pension is still to be paid to her in full discharge against these arrears and unpaid dues.

13. Today, as this order is being dictated in Court it is acknowledged that whoever may be responsible, a sum representing Rs. 10020/- has yet to be paid to the Petitioner. This only shows that unless the government servant can arrange for pressures or personal contacts for the payment of his service dues and pension, that file is slept upon unless energised by a contempt proceeding. This also shows that straightaway as a tailor made exercise retirement benefits are not processed as a smooth operation. Withholding post retirement benefits of government employees as a generality has been reduced to a crude and rough game. The time has come for the Court to notice that the presumption is irresistible that to eliminate the harassment for receiving retiral service benefit, a retired government employee has to pay a price. This includes the harassment to widows who chase their late husband's arrears of pay and other post retirement benefits. The present contempt proceeding is one such example. Otherwise, a special group category deals with such cases at the High Court. All cases of pensions and widows' pensions not paid including arrears of salary not delivered even after retirement. Does the State Government has. a special cell, likewise also? If the High Court can devote so much time to such matters why cannot the State of Bihar give some attention to such matters also. At least three months before a government servant retires the exercise on processing post retirement should begin. Papers should be ready to be delivered a week before a government staff retires. Delayed payment is to be given with interest. State of Kerala and Others Vs. M. Padmanabhan Nair, Thus, the present contempt application was not without cause. It cannot be said that the contempt

application was not bonafide or that it was frivolous.

14. The question which has to be answered is whether the officer, who saw a conviction and sentence to be imprisoned for 7 days for having committed contempt has been rightfully sentenced? Beyond doubt is he responsible solely? Has he wilfully shown disobedience to the High Court's order dated 15 July 2001? The proceedings for contempt have its origins in this order.

15. It is on record that he had been made an opposite party by the order of 16 July 2001. Thus, he comes into the picture as on that day. He was entitled to take a defence that if the contempt proceedings were leading to a situation which would lead to his conviction, then their ought to have been a resort to the principle of strict proof liability. These are quasi criminal proceeding. If the matter is examined on who exactly should have been visited with an order of conviction then the issue is not that the Appellant was the disrespectful violator of the High Court and a contemnor consequently. The Appellant was added as a party to monitor this whole sordid murky episode and co-ordinate amongst more than one department and arrange for the finalisation and ultimate payment of all the dues to the widow. To this extent even senior counsel for the Appellant has acknowledged the fact that there has been laches in delivering post retirement benefits both as dues of the widow's husband and the widow's pension to her. Thus, the anxiety of the learned Judge on the state of affairs, as recorded, is not incorrect.

16. The only technicality which now is to be seen is whether the issues in the contempt were so that the person under an order of conviction, a sentence of seven days in prison, clearly understood that the proceeding if taken its logical conclusion would result an indictment on all or one of them. And, that one was him. But, for the order dated 16 July 2001 which permitted adding the Appellant as an opposite party to the cause to face contempt proceedings there were many others under notice. To be precise seven opposite parties of different departments, ministries and administration. On record these are: 1. Shri U.K. Sinha, the Commissioner and Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, 2. Sri. Ram Dayal Sinha, the Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Additional Secretary-cum-Special Secretary, Road Construction Department, Patna, 3. Sri. Arun Kumar Singh, the Accountant General (A and E) II, Bihar, Patna, 4. Sri. Bisheshwar Nath Thakur, the District Provident Fund Officer, Khagaria, 5. Sri. Stefen Lucas, the Under Secretary, Finance, Personnel Claim Cell, Patna, 6. Sri. Prabhu Dayal Prasad, the Treasury Officer, Patna, and 7. Sr A.K. Upadhyay, the Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (added recently on 16.7.2001).

17. Once the principle is acknowledged that if a person is to be judged for contempt and conviction is a matter under consideration, then two aspects have to be kept in mind. A conviction must follow after taking into consideration the principle of strict proof liability upon framing of charges if the situation warrants examination of detailed facts. Unless the matter is so clear that a charge need

not be framed. The matter of strict proof liability can be examined only after a charge has been framed. In the present case a charge has not been framed. In the facts and circumstances of the present case there were many players.

18. If a contemptuous action was to be judged there was much more to be examined in this matter in the totality of the record whether the writ petition or the contempt application and the present appeal on it.

19. If all the opposite parties arrayed as opposite parties were to be summoned, charges framed against them and then an opportunity permitted to offer their defense on the contemptuous situation, then many more than the Appellant would be lined up to answer the charge of contempt. In the circumstances, the Court judging a civil contempt must put itself in a position to consider the objections and examine whether a charge needs to be framed. If this is done, then the framing of a charge itself is a step in aid which virtually obliges a Court to judge a contempt in objectivity on the principle of strict proof liability.

20. While on this aspect, a decision of the Supreme Court in the matter of State of Jammu & Kashmir Vs. Mohd. Yaqoob Khan and Others, The issue in the present case was an action of contempt against the State Respondents. Whether an interim order had been violated or not was another aspect. The Supreme Court was of the view that if a contempt is to be based on an ad interim order then the Respondents are entitled to an opportunity to contest the order, make a plea for modification of the order or for that matter of the recall of the order. If this exercise is to be gone into, then, it is implicit that an opportunity has to be offered to the Respondents for filing their defense. Then, meeting the merits of an allegation on contempt can be seen in a better perspective with the total record which includes the record which carries orders, directions or the judgment which gives rise to a contempt action being judged. A civil contempt proceeding before a Court of record is an action arising out of the same record which carry the order or the judgment whose performance is alleged to be breached. It is this fundamental principle which has been time tested for a century that a breach of an injunction under Order 39 Rule 2A of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, is examined by the same Court which passed the order, judgment or decree. The underlying principle being not to judge contempt, firstly, away from the record and, secondly, away from the division of the Court which normally passed the order or the judgment. The exceptions are when the Court itself may decline, the non-availability of the Court and an appeal. Otherwise, it leads to multiplicity of litigation, arrears at the High Court and more controversies beyond the record like an opportunity not offered when the mandatory injunction was granted or a denial of an opportunity to have the injunction modified or even vacated. But this would be in the main case. The contempt proceedings have to be part of it, and before the same Court. In the present case, counsel for the Appellant, the contemnor convicted and the Petitioner of the writ petition who brought the action of contempt, have jointly accepted and stated that the totality of the record, inter parties, which was sent

for by this Court in appeal was not before the learned Judge who passed the order of conviction. They also accept that if it had been, perhaps the orders would have been different.

21. The anomalous situation in the present case needs to be reflected upon. The contempt alleged was against the Accountant General and the Treasury Officer. The man booked to go to prison was a subsequent successor to office. One A.K. Upadhyay, Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna. His predecessors even avoided answering notices and show causes issued to them. Then, the High Court may also consider reflecting on another aspect. In the circumstances of the issues in the present case, the disposal of the case at the admission stage on 15 July 1999, did not solve the issue, it created more litigation. The other cases which multiplied were (i) a review or application for more time in the writ petition, (ii) a Letters Patent Appeal arising out of the writ petition, (iii) a civil contempt application and (iv) the present appeal under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Five cases. The controversy still lingers on those who disrespected the High Court orders and got away. The disposal at the admission stage, was on the faith that the orders would be obeyed or justice would be done to the case of a citizen who had approached the High Court. The case bore no result if more delay and more cases were to be filed. A rule of interim mandamus, as a direction perhaps would have been more effective.

22. Then the State of Bihar must consider seriously as the largest identified, litigant before the High Court, that inaction by its functionaries bogs the High Court with litigation. The State of Bihar must consider setting up a grievance cell for matters relating to pensions, widow pensions or family pension, as a special bureau. This is to prevent situations like the present one at the High Court. A special group category also ties up a special division of the High Court in dealing with such cases. Let those who got away in this contempt action, let not sit in arm chairs as the ones who escaped. The High Court will take a report from the Chief Secretary within one month from today that a Special Cell has been opened complete with the name of the personnel under the charge of an Officer not below the rank of a Joint Secretary to deal with the grievances and complaints of retired State Government employees including their widows or husbands or heirs. These would be those employees whose initial appointment is not in controversy by an inquiry or a Court proceeding. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, those opposite parties, who, in fact, showed disrespect to the Court's order have virtually avoided the contempt proceedings conveniently. If the Appellant has not shown disrespect to the order of the High Court nor committed willful contempt, it cannot be certified that other opposite parties are innocent. They are all State Respondents, all functionaries of the State Government. They have disrespected the order of the Court. If all the opposite parties cannot be punished with imprisonment, then some one has to pay the fine to redress the situation and as a deterrent not to ignore the orders of the Court in future. This fine will have to be paid before the Registrar General, High Court.

23. The situation may be contemptuous but it would not be correct in holding that the contemnor or Appellant A.K. Upadhyay was the one who should have carried the conviction. There were others also who were answerable to the Court unless the circumstances are such that the Appellant A.K. Upadhyay had wilfully disobeyed the order of the Court. This is not so. Appellant A.K. Upadhyay had offered his defense by a sworn affidavit dated 10.9.2001. This was supposed to be in pursuance of the direction of as the Court dated 3 September 2001 that he must show cause on or before 10 September. When the matter was listed on 10 September 2001, the affidavit had not been filed in Court. This led the Court to have the proceedings served on opposite party No. 7, newly added (A.K. Upadhyay, Secretary, Department of Road Construction). The proceedings were meant to be served through the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna. By this time the case was proceeding for hearing of the contempt application itself.

24. As the contempt petition originally stood the government of the grievance of the Petitioner Smt. Chintamani Sinha was against the Accountant General, Bihar and the Treasury Officer, Patna. This is clear from the record in her pleadings in paragraphs 9, 11, 13 and 14. The Appellant was coming into the circumference of contempt proceedings on being impleaded as a party as late as on 16 July 2001.

25. It needs to be mentioned at this stage that the State Vounsel Mr. Ajay Bihari Sinha, Standing Counsel No. 10, filed his personal affidavit acknowledging that the show cause as an affidavit of the Appellant A.K. Upadhyay though it should have been prepared and filed earlier was delayed and there was laches at the Standing Counsel's office and, thus, affirmed on 10 September 2001 in the afternoon and filed later.

26. The State Counsel appears to be acting as a good Samaritan in coming to the aid of a Government official as if alibiing for the situation, after he has been hauled up for contempt. It would have much better and in the interest of public justice if the State Counsel had advised all the State Respondents arrayed as parties not to offer explanations but to arrange payment of retirement dues of the Petitioner's husband and widow's pension to her. The Court will not comment on the affidavit and the Standing Counsel except that counsel should not be involving themselves with causes which concern their clients, because it compromises with public justice.

27. However, in the present case the Court is of the opinion that as strict proof liability had yet to be determined and charges had not framed, more so when there were several others against whom there were allegations of contempt, the entire blame could not be apportioned solely on the Appellant A.K. Upadhyay. If the totality of circumstances are taken into account, in the context of the present case, the complexion of the gravamen of the charge rests on many more authorities. The allegations of the Petitioner-Appellant were against entirely different persons or authorities.

28. In these circumstances, the order of conviction is set aside. But, since there has been a contemptuous situation throughout and laches is consistent throughout the record, the State of Bihar shall pay a fine in taking matters too lightly despite the order of the Court. This should also act as a deterrent that post retirement benefits of Government employees should not be sat upon, but processed strictly in the spirit indicated by the Supreme Court. The fine at Rs. 2000/- be deposited before the Registrar General, High Court, Patna and, thereafter, transmitted to the State Treasury.

29. The appeal succeeds in part. The order of conviction and sentence on the Appellant A.K. Upadhyay to undergo simple imprisonment for seven days is set aside. In lieu of it, this Court substitutes a fine on the State of Bihar as indicated above.

30. The Registrar General will send a copy of this order to the Chief Secretary and the Law Secretary, Bihar.