

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18560 of 2015

=====

Md. Mojibur Rahman Son of late Md. Idu Hussain resident of Village Bara
sohagi, Post Office Chattargach Police Station Pothia, Distt Kishanganj.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director of Agriculture Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Regional Director , Agriculture University Sabour, Bhagalpur.
5. The Vice Chancellor Bihar Agriculture University Sabour ,Bhagalpur.
6. The Bihar Agriculture University Sabour, Bhagalpur. through its Registrar.
7. The Director of Administration Agriculture Department Bihar.
8. The Accountant General ,Bihar, Patna.
9. The District Provident Fund Officer, Bhagalpur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Najmul Hoda, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anil Kumar, AC to SC 10
For the Respondent : Mr. Chandra Mohan Singh, Advocate
University :
For the Accountant General: Mr. Kameshwar Prasad Gupta, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

2 16-05-2016

Heard.

It is contended on behalf of the respondent Bihar
Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur that Rs. 1,55,316/- has
been paid to the petitioner vide cheque no. 466511 dated
11.3.2016 up to February, 2016 against the head of pension.
Similarly GPF amount of Rs. 2,67,204/- is also being claimed to
have been paid vide Demand Draft No. 501803 dated 11.8.2015.
Learned counsel further informs that Rs. 1,89,881/- has been paid

through cheque no. 015983 dated 20.11.2015 as against the Group Insurance amount and Rs. 7,25,588/- has also been paid through cheque no. 466507 dated 16.2.2016 as against the head of gratuity. It is also stated that leave encashment amount of Rs. 4,39,750/- has been paid to the petitioner through cheque no. 466511 dated 11.3.2016 and it is also stated that salary, D.A. etc. have already been paid.

In view of such categorical statements having been made by learned counsel for the respondent - University on instruction, in my view this writ application now has lost its efficacy and, as such, the same is disposed of.

However, it is made clear that if the petitioner feels aggrieved then he may ask for calculation done against each head and, thereafter, may represent before the Comptroller of the University raising his grievance.

It is stated that pension till February, 2016 has been paid. However, the respondent University must assure that pension is paid on monthly basis to the petitioner.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Spd/-

U			
---	--	--	--