

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15485 of 2015

=====

Hare Ram Choudhary son of Ram Sagar Choudhary, Resident of village- Rampur Tola, (Bajinathpur), P.S.- Beriya, District- Baliya (U.P.)

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Chairman, State Bank of India, Madam Cama Road, Mumbai- 400021
2. The Managing Director, State Bank of India, Madam Cama Road, Mumbai- 400021
3. The Chief General Manager (HR), State Bank of India, Madam Cama Road, Mumbai- 400021
4. The Zonal Manager, State Bank of India, Main Branch Building, West of Gandhi Maidan, Patna, Bihar
5. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bhikhna Pahari Branch, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the Respondents: Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate.
Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-05-2016

Heard parties.

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that his father, who was IVth Grade employee working as sweeper in State Bank of India, Bhikhna Pahari Branch, Patna died while in service on 26.10.2004. However, except EPF amount, nothing has been paid to the petitioner, such as, gratuity, life insurance, leave encashment and other dues.

The petitioner had represented his claim for payment of above dues before the respondents vide Annexure-3 series.

Accordingly, this writ application is disposed of with a direction to respondent no. 5, Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bikhna Pahari Branch, Patna to transmit all the records with respect to the father of the petitioner to the respondent no. 4 i.e. Zonal Manager, State Bank of India, Main Branch Building, West of Gandhi Maidan, Patna, Bihar who shall consider the case of the petitioner and take a decision in accordance with the law within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order as the petitioner's father had died while in service in the year 2004 itself and the claim of the appointment on Compassionate Ground has already been refused and, as such, it is urged that the petitioner is facing much hardship. The admissible dues of the petitioner should be paid within a further period of one month after such decision is taken. If the claim of the petitioner is not found tenable then a reasoned order would be required to be passed by respondent no. 4.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J.)

ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--