

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11452 of 2008

=====

Deena Nath Upadhaya son of late Bachu Upadhaya, resident of Mohalla – Hanuman Nagar, Anaith, Milki, Ara.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Land Reforms Commissioner Revenue Department Government of Bihar Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. Director of Survey, Settlement Revenue Department Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat Patna
4. The Commissioner cum Secretary, Department of Finance, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. Land Survey Settlement Officer Govt. of Bihar Old Secretariat Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharmesh Kr. Shrivastava

For the Respondent/s : AC to GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3. 21-08-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.C. to Govt. Advocate – 10.

The petitioner, who superannuated w.e.f. 31-03-2008, has approached this Court with a prayer to direct the respondents to grant Junior/Senior Selection Grade and also grant Super Time Scale promotion to the petitioner. Further prayer has been made for directing the respondents to pay the salary on which he discharged his duties as Head Inspector i.e. on the higher post from 10-06-2002 to 30-11-2004.

In this case, a counter affidavit has been filed and in paragraph – 11, a specific stand has been taken that the petitioner was granted 1st Time Bound Promotion and 2nd Time Bound

Promotion in the scale of Senior Selection Grade and he was granted 1st A.C.P. in the scale of 4500-7000 w.e.f. 09-08-1999, which was equivalent to Super Time Scale. The petitioner was granted monetary benefit of 2nd A.C.P. in the scale of Rs. 5000-8000 w.e.f. 09-08-1999 and as such, so far as first relief is concerned, the petitioner was already granted. In respect of claim of salary on the plea of discharging duty as Head Inspector, it has been indicated in paragraph – 12 of the counter affidavit that it was temporary and stop-gap arrangement, for which, no monetary benefit was required to be given.

In view of facts disclosed in the counter affidavit, the Court is of the opinion that no further relief is required to be granted.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--