

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18440 of 2015

=====

Jagdish Singh, Son of Late Bhulan Singh, R/o village - Gauspur Izara, P.S. Hajipur
Sadar, District - Vaishali

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The General Manager-cum- the Chief Engineer Electric Supply Region, Patna
2. The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
3. The Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Commissioner Akangarsarai, District -
Nalanda

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 :		Mr. Vikash Chandra Srivastava, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 13-05-2016

Heard parties.

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that this is the third time, the petitioner has come to this Court by filing writ petition for granting retiral benefits. He had filed three contempt cases also. On earlier occasion, the petitioner has filed C.W.J.C. No. 4977 of 2011, which was disposed of on 16.03.2011. Thereafter, he filed C.W.J.C. No. 12394 of 2013, which was disposed of on 19.11.2013. He had filed contempt application also. From the order passed in the contempt case, it appears that the directions were complied with. Still the petitioner has again come before this Court by filing the present writ application.

A counter affidavit has been filed stating therein that all the dues of the petitioner including revision of scale have been paid in the year 2014 itself but surprisingly Annexure-D shows that certain amount was paid to the petitioner on 26.04.2016 i.e. after filing of the writ application as it is stated in Annexure-D that the revised gratuity amount of Rs. 79,200/- has been paid to the petitioner through Cheque No. 123638 dated 26.04.2016.

Be that as it may, now it appears that all the retiral dues due to the petitioner have been paid after revising it and lastly the revised gratuity amount has also been paid vide Annexure-D, thus, in my view, this writ application has lost its efficacy and the same stands disposed of.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Vats/-

U			
---	--	--	--