

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23640 of 2013

=====

1. Kaushal Kishore Verma S/O Late Kameshwar Prasad Resident Of Mohalla-
Rajeev Nagar, Road No. 8, P.S- Rajiv Nagar, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Road Construction
Department, Office Situated At Nirman Bhawan, Bailey Road, P.S- Shastrinagar,
District- Patna.
2. The Executive Engineer, Construction Division No. 2, Building Construction
Department, Nirman Bhawan, Bailey Road, P.S- Shastrinagar, District- Patna.
3. The Director General, Provident Fund Directorate, Pant Bhawan Bailey Road,
Patna.
4. The Assistant Director, General Provident Fund, Pant Bhawan, Bailey Road,
Patna.
5. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Division No. 1, Gaya.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Advocate

For the State : Mr. P.K. Verma, AAG 5

Dr. Mankeshwar Sinha, AC to AAG 5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 19-04-2016

Heard the parties.

In the present writ petition petitioner is seeking relief for
granting G.P.F. loan. In the pleading of the writ petition it has
been stated that on account of marriage of his daughter as well as
illness of his wife he applied for loan of G.P.F but due to callous
attitude the loan has not been sanctioned by the authority
concerned.

Learned counsel for the State has filed counter affidavit. In



paragraph 3 of the same it has been stated that on the application form of G.P.F.loan amount of Rs.1,23,120/- has been sanctioned in favour of the petitioner vide office order no.12 under memo no.605 dated 11.4.2016 and the same has been sent to the treasury. Respondent has also annexed three letters which are Annexures A, B and C to the counter affidavit corroborating the statement.

In such view of the matter, there is no purpose to keep the matter pending for any further. Accordingly in view of the statement made in the counter affidavit this writ petition is disposed of.

It is expected that Treasury Officer will make payment to the petitioner without unnecessary delay preferably within one week from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. If payment has not made within the stipulated period this Court may take serious view of the matter.

During course of argument learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though petitioner is discharging his duty but his salary has been stopped. Petitioner, if so advised, may approach the appropriate authority for payment of salary.

This Court is not giving any opinion on the merit or de-

merit with respect to payment of salary.

With the aforesaid observation this writ petition is disposed of.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Vinay/-

U			
---	--	--	--