

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17020 of 2010

Jayanti Devi, (Widow), W/o Late Hardeo Prasad Singh, R/o Village Bahdura,
P.S.Rupauli, Distt-Purnea

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Madhepura
4. The District Education Officer, Madhepura
5. The Treasury Officer, Madhepura
6. The Accountant General Bihar, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
7. The Branch Manager/Incharge Branch Manager, State Bank of India Udaikishunganj, in the District of Madhepura
8. S.K.Modi, S/o not known, at present Posted As Senior Accountant, State Bank of India, Udaikishunganj, Madhepura, Being The Incharge Branch Manager

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Shri Ranjan Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondents : Smt. Nivedita Nirvikar, Adv.
Shri Kumar Pankaj, Adv.
Shri Kaushalendra Kr. Singh, Adv.
Shri Sunil Kr. Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-01-2015

The petitioner is the widow of late Hardeo Prasad Singh, who was employed as an Assistant Teacher in a Government School. Shri Singh died on 12.1.1985. Thereafter, the petitioner was sanctioned family pension. She was making representations from time to time for enhancement of pension. One such representation was made on 25.3.2009. She stated that there is a short payment of pension; which by that date, aggregated to

Rs.1,31,815/-; calculated at the rate of Rs.141 per month.

This writ petition is filed complaining that no steps have been taken on the representation.

On behalf of the respondents, counter affidavit is filed. It is stated that after the writ petition was filed, the matter was examined and a sum of Rs.1,34,350/- was credited to the account of the petitioner.

Heard Shri Ranjan Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Smt. Nivedita Nirvikar, learned counsel for the respondents.

It must be said to the credit of the respondents that they are objective and considerate enough. Without being technical, they have remitted the differential amount. In a way, the amount remitted is more than what the petitioner expected. With the remittance of Rs.1,34,350/-, the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed.

Therefore, the writ petition is closed. It does not need any mention that, in case the petitioner is of the view that any other amount due to her is not paid, she can file a representation in this behalf.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Interlocutory application, if any, stands disposed of.

(L. Narasimha Reddy,CJ)

K.C.jha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

