IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19655 of 2014

==

Basant Kumar Yadav, Son of Late Satya Narayan Rai, Resident of Village-Muraul, P.S-Sakra, District-Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director Agriculture Department Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Block Development Officer, Muraul, Muzaffarpur
4. The Circle Officer, Muraul,Muzaffarpur
5. The Vice -Chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University, Bihar, Pusa, Samastipur
6. The Registrar, Rajendra Agriculture University, Bihar, Pusa, Samastipur
7. The Principal, Tirhut Agricultural College, Dholi, Muzaffapur
8. The In Charge Officer, Security Section Tirhut Agricultural College, Dholi, Muzaffapur
9. The Farm In Charge Security Section Tirhut Agricultural College, Dholi, Muzaffapur

.... Respondent/s

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent nos.1to4 : Mr. Md.Anis Akhtar, AC to GA-1
For the Respondent nos.5to9 : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal, Adv.

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-05-2016 The petitioner has filed the present writ petition seeking a direction to the respondents to pay provident fund amount with interest to the successor of late Satyanarayan Rai, who was working as daily wage employee in the Security Section of Tirhut Agriculture College, Dholi, Muzaffarpur.

In paragraph 3 of the writ petition, it has been stated that aforesaid Satyanarayan Rai was the father of the petitioner who was working on daily wage basis from 27.08.1978 to 18.12.2011. In paragraph 5 of the writ petition, it has been stated that father of the petitioner died on 11.03.2012. However, in the whole writ petition, it has nowhere been stated that from daily wage paid to the aforesaid employee any amount was deducted towards provident fund account.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos.5 to 9, on the other hand, submitted that no deduction was made from the daily wage of the father of the petitioner towards provident fund account and, therefore, the present writ petition filed on behalf of the petitioner is completely misconceived and is fit to be dismissed.

In absence of any material that father of the petitioner was ever regularized in regular establishment and any deduction was made even from his daily wage, the whole claims raised on behalf of the petitioner in the present writ petition seem to be completely misconceived and untenable.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, dismissed, but without costs.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			