

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4540 of 2012

=====

Smt. Subhadra Kumari, Wife of Late Arjun Prasad Sharma, Resident of Village-
Mohabbatpur, P.S.-Shekhopur Sarai, District-Sheikhpura

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Provident Fund, Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Lakhisarai
5. The District Provident Fund Officer, Munghyer
6. The District Provident Fund Officer, Lakhisarai
7. The Treasury Officer, Lakhisarai
8. The Block Development Officer, Halsi, Lakhisarai

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :
For the State : Mr. Manoj kr. Ambasta G.P-14
Mr. T.N.Ambastha, AC to GP 14
For the Acct. Gen. : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-07-2016

Nobody appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the State is present and files
supplementary counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent no. 5.

Learned counsel for the Accountant General is also present.

The writ petition has been filed seeking payment of
Provident Fund along with statutory interest as well as further interest.

Counter affidavits have been filed on behalf of the
respondent no. 2, 5 and respondents no. 4 and 8, copies of which have been
served upon the learned counsel for the petitioner.

From the supplementary counter affidavit filed today, it
transpires that the petitioner, having superannuated in the year 2003, has

been paid the G.P.F. amount in December, 2015, which includes interest up to November, 2015. Copy of the same has been served on learned counsel for the petitioner on 17.12.2015, but no rejoinder to the supplementary counter affidavit has been filed.

It further appears that an Interlocutory Application No. 9786 of 2015 has also been filed for substitution of the writ petitioner by her daughter.

In view of the fact that amount of G.P.F., along with up- to-date interest, had already been sanctioned in favour of the writ petitioner, the Court does not deem it necessary for substituting her in the present proceeding as the grievance stands redressed.

From the records, it transpires that there is no categorical statement on behalf of the respondents that the amount has been credited in the account of the original writ petitioner. The respondents shall ensure that the same is done within one month from today positively.

As the order is being passed in presence of learned counsel for the State, no formal production of a copy of this order is required before the concerned authority.

The writ petition stands disposed off in the aforementioned terms.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

Sujit/-

U			
---	--	--	--