

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4987 of 2015

=====

Chandrakala Devi. Wife of Late Raghuveer Paswan. Resident of village + P.O.-
Saisai, P.S.+ District - Saharsa.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Public Health Engineering Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Special Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer, Department of Public Health Engineering (Mechanical), Bihar, Patna.
5. The Zonal Chief Engineers, Purnea Zone, Purnea.
6. The Superintendent Engineers, Public Health Engineering Circle-Saharsa.
7. The Executive Engineer, Public Health Division, Saharsa.
8. The Sub-Divisional Officer-cum-Assistant Engineer, Public Health Engineering, Sub-Division - Saharsa.
9. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
10. The District Provident Fund Officer, Saharsa.
11. The Treasury Officer, Saharsa.
12. The Account General (A & E) Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Siyaram Pandey, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Kumar Alok, Adv.
For the Accountant General	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Arun, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-12-2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

At the very outset, the Court is shocked to notice that the case was listed out of turn hearing on the basis of motion slip filed by learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Siyaram Pandey on 02.12.2015 in which a categorical statement was made that the husband of the petitioner died in harness on 22.03.2009 but till date nothing is paid to the petitioner nor even the pension is fixed. Thus, in view of the fact that nothing was paid to the

widow petitioner, the Court had heard the matter on priority basis.

Upon perusal of the record it transpires that an amount of Rs. 63,507/- has been paid towards G.P.F., Rs. 15,317/+ Rs. 16,360/- for Group Insurance, Rs. 7,784/- on account of Leave Encashment and further Rs. 1,72,807/- has also been deposited in her account as difference of pay amount.

From the aforesaid, it is clear that substantive payment has been made to the petitioner and still a statement was made that nothing has been paid which is a brazen attempt to mislead the Court by stating absolutely wrong facts for which the Court may have passed appropriate orders but leaves the matter without doing so.

However, taking note of such conduct, the Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter under its extraordinary prerogative writ jurisdiction and accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

U		T	
---	--	---	--