

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18745 of 2012

=====

1. Umesh Lal Karn S/O Late Keshwar Lal Karn Resident Of Village- Rikhauli,
P.O- Paktola, P.S- Dumara, District- Sitamarhi.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary Revenue A Nd Land Reforms Department Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Sheohar, Distt- Sheohar.
3. The Director Provident Fund Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Provident Officer, Sheohar, Distt- Sheohar.
5. The Sub- Divisional Officer Sheohar, Distt- Sheohar.
6. The Circle Officer Block Dumari Katsari, Distt- Sheohar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sunil kr. Mandal, SC 3
Mr. Bipin Kumar, AC to SC 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 12-08-2016

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The present application has been filed seeking direction to the respondents for payment of General Provident Fund amount to the petitioner, who retired as Head Clerk from the Anchal Office of Dumari Katsari, in the district of Sheohar, with effect from 30.11.2010. The petitioner has also sought for payment of other retiral dues, which he is entitled to, but those other retiral dues have not been described.

The pleadings in the writ application relate to

non-payment of General Provident Fund amount only.

A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the District Provident Fund Officer, Sitamarhi, stating therein that entire admissible amount of General Provident Fund has been paid to the petitioner. A calculation chart, in this regard, has also been brought on record by way of annexure to the said counter affidavit.

Considering the above, this application is disposed of.

It is, however, made clear that if, according to the petitioner, there is some discrepancy in the calculation of General Provident Fund amount, he shall be at liberty to approach the District Provident Fund Officer, Sitamarhi, within a period of one month from today. Though there is no description of other retiral dues, which the petitioner was entitled to, and have not been paid, it is observed that the petitioner may raise such claim before the appropriate authority, if, according to him, such amounts have not been paid to him.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	16.08.2016
Transmission Date	16.08.2016