

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 21465 of 2014**

=====

Radha Devi, wife of Late Manoj Kumar Singh, resident of village + Post –  
Pipra P.S. Baniapur, District – Saran (Chapra).

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Commissioner, Employees Provident Fund Organisation sub-Regional Officer Kachahari Parisar, Muzaffarpur.
2. The Senior Manager, Punjab National Bank, Chapra Branch, Chapra.
3. The Punjab National Bank through its Circle Head, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Branch Manager, Punjab National Bank, Hathua Market Branch, Chapra.
5. The Branch Manager, Punjab National Bank, Pankaj Market Branch, Muzaffarpur.

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan  
Mr. Madhav Krishna

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4. 28-09-2015                      Heard Sri Gyan Prakash, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Madhav Krishna, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no. 1/Employees Provident Fund Organisation as well as Sri Kumar Priya Ranjan, learned counsel for remaining respondents i.e. Punjab National Bank.

The petitioner, who is widow of an employee who died long back on 20-06-1998, has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition in the month of December, 2014, with a prayer to direct the respondents to make payment of admitted dues of her husband's pension w.e.f. 21-06-1998 to 30<sup>th</sup> September, however; orally learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it was up-to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2005, though the year has not been

mentioned in the prayer portion of the writ petition.

In this case, separate counter affidavits have been filed on behalf of respondent/E.P.F.O. as well as on behalf of Bank. A plea has been taken that earlier since the Bank account was not opened in the name of petitioner, the amount, though was sent for its credit, could not be credited. However, during the pendency of the writ petition, after noticing the fact that account has already been opened, arrear has been credited in the account of the petitioner in the year 2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioner claims that at least in 2008 itself, the petitioner had opened her account in the Bank and as such, the respondents were required to pay interest from the date of sanction till the date of opening of the account of the petitioner, which has not been done.

The Court is of the opinion that regarding interest, while exercising writ jurisdiction, this Court may not adjudicate.

Keeping in view the fact that the claimed amount has already been credited to the account of the petitioner, there is no point for passing any positive order.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J.)**

Anay

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|