

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20511 of 2014

=====

Manoj Kumar Sinha S/o Late Vishamabhar Pd. Sinha Resident of village +
P.O. + P.S. - Supaul, District - Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Finance Commissioner Pension Cell, Bihar, Patna.
3. Commissioner cum Secretary, Dept, of Foods Supply & Consumer Protection, Bihar.
4. Accountant General, Bihar Patna, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.
5. Collector, Saharsa.
6. District Provident Officer, Saharsa.
7. Sub Divisional Officer, Simri Bakhtiyarpur, District - Saharsa.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Mallika Mazumdar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar (SC-12)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 20-08-2016 Heard Mrs. Mallika Mazumdar and Mr. Pankaj Kumar the
counsel for the State.

Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent nos. 5 and 7
as well as the respondent-District Provident Fund Officer are
filed.

No rejoinder thereto is filed.

The petitioner served the State Government and retired
from service as Supply Inspector on 31.08.2012. Since all the
retrial dues such as pension, gratuity, leave encashment, group
insurance and GPF were not paid to him by the respondents-
State, the present writ application is filed for a direction upon the
respondents-State to authorize all the pensionary dues of the
petitioner.



In the counter affidavit of the respondent nos. 5 and 7, the relevant retrial dues payment made to the petitioner have been detailed in paragraph 3. It is stated that upon receipt of the application for final withdrawal of provident fund amount, the same has also been processed and forwarded to the District Provident Fund Officer, Saharsa for final withdrawal of the GPF amount. In paragraph 6, it is further stated that the petitioner has been paid the leave encashment, gratuity and the provisional pension. The rest of the dues of the petitioner are under process for payment.

Having appreciated the stand taken in the counter affidavit, the counsel for the petitioner states that the application be disposed of permitting the petitioner to make appropriate representation(s), if the amount sanctioned and paid to the petitioner are found deficient.

After having heard the parties, the writ application is disposed of permitting the petitioner to represent before the concerned respondent(s), if it is found that the amount disbursed/paid against diverse head of retrial benefits are deficient or suffers from discrepancy.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--