

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1430 of 2009

=====

Braj Nandan Prasad Singh, son of Late Rameshwar Prasad Singh, HIG Flat
No. 7HF-03/18 Bahadurpur Housing Colony, P.S. Agamkuan, Patna
..... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through The Industrial Development
Commissioner, Department of Industries, new Secretariat, Patna
 2. the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Industrial
Development Corporation, Indira Bhawan, Ramcharitara Singh
Path, near Bailey road Crossing, Patna
 3. the Bihar Industrial Area Development authority Udyog Bhawan ,
East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna, through it's Managing director
 4. the managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development
Authority, Udyog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna
 5. the Executive Director, Regional office, Bihar Industrial Area
Development Authority, Bela Industrial Area, Muzaffarpur
 6. The chief Account Officer, Regional Office, Bihar Industrial Area
Development Authority, Bela Industrial Area, Muzaffarpur
..... Respondent/s
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bishwajeet Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Pd.
Mrs. Binita Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2015 Heard Sri Bishwajeet Singh, learned counsel for the

petitioner, Sri Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, learned counsel who has

appeared on behalf of the respondent no. 1 and 2 / Bihar State

Industrial Development Corporation and Smt. Binita Singh,

learned counsel for the respondent no. 3 to 6 / Bihar Industrial

Area Development Authority.

The petitioner, who was an employee of the Bihar State

Industrial Development Corporation and served for a long period

on deputation in the Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority,

has approached this court with a prayer to direct the respondents to pay the arrear of salary, amount of provident fund, gratuity as well as payment of leave salary particularly for the period during which he was on deputation in the BIADA.

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that in view of the earlier order dated 27.9.2013, during the pendency of the writ petition all other grievances of the petitioner have already been redressed save and except payment of leave salary.

In this case no counter affidavit has been filed by either of the respondents, whereas, the writ petition was filed in the month of January, 2009 itself.

In view of the facts and circumstances, the court is of the opinion that the writ petition can be disposed of with a direction to the respondent no. 3 to 6 to take all steps for making payment of admitted due amount of leave salary to the petitioner preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U			
---	--	--	--