

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4816 of 2014

=====

Surendra Prasad Singh S/O Late Suryadeo Sharma Resident Of Village Satparsha, Police Station Dhanarua In The District Of Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1.The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretarty, Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
- 2.The District Magistrate cum Collector, Patna.
- 3.The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Patna.
- 4.The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Barh, Patna.
- 5.The Block Development Officer, Mokama, Patna
- 6.The District Provident Fund Officer, Patna.
- 7.The Treasury Officer, Masaurhi in the district of Patna.
- 8.The Accountant General, Patna, Bihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sunil Kr. Mandal SC-24 & Mr. Bipin Kumar, Adv

For the A.G. : Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

3 23-04-2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Having regard to the fact that the petitioner a retired Panchayat Secretary has a grievance as with regard to payment of his retirement benefit including pension, gratuity and GPF, this Court will have no difficulty in directing the concerned Block Development Officer as also the concerned Treasury Officer to make such payment because the Accountant General in the counter affidavit has made it clear that such amount of



pension and gratuity has already been authorized by the Office of the Accountant General way back on 16.01.2014 and in fact a communication has also been sent to the Treasury Officer on 05.05.2014. As with regard to claim of GPF, the District Provident fund Officer, Patna is directed to ensure that whatever amount of provident fund with up-to-date statutory interest is found payable also must be paid to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order.

So far as the relief seeking arrears of salary is concerned, this Court is not inclined to entertain it because it is not a retirement benefit and thus for this purpose the petitioner may have to move appropriate authority/Court.

With the aforementioned observation and direction, this application is disposed of.

(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)

Ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--