

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10313 of 2015

=====

Md. Hadish Ansari, son of Md. Latif Ansari, resident of village-
Kharagpura, P.O. Dehri, P.S. Rajpur, District- Buxar, presently residing at
Mohalla- Bhagwanpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur
..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Bihar, Patna
2. The Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi, District- Sitamarhi
3. The Treasury Officer, Buxar, District- Buxar
4. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna

..... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, A.C. to G.A. 8
For the A.G. : Mr. Dharendra Chaubey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

2 20-07-2015

Heard.

Petitioner claims to have retired from the post of Police Inspector on 31.07.1998 from Sitamarhi and he is getting his pension thereafter. However, his pension has not been revised in terms of Annexure 3 which is a Government resolution with respect to the revision of pension of the pensioners who had retired prior to 01.01.2006 on account of 5th and 6th pay revision despite a representation having been filed vide Annexure 4 to the respondent no.2, the Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi.

In above view of the matter, this writ application is being disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before the Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi

along with a copy of this order. In such case, let him take a decision in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of filing of such representation. In case, the petitioner is found entitled then proper sanction order should be issued by the competent authority within two weeks thereafter. After taking such decision, the matter should be sent immediately to the office of the Accountant General for necessary authorization which should be done by it in accordance with law within a further period of two weeks.

In case the petitioner's claim does not find favour with the respondent no.2 then a reasoned order would be required to be passed by him recording the grounds on which the petitioner's claim has not been found tenable.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Sanjay-II/-

U			
---	--	--	--