

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7102 of 2016**

=====

1. Yamuna Ravidas, Son of late Shivdhari Ravidas, Village -  
Mirchak, P.S. - Bhagwanganj, District - Patna.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Health  
Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

2. The Director-in-Chief, Health Department, Government of  
Bihar, Patna.

3. The Director, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

4. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.

5. The Collector, District - Patna.

6. The Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, District - Patna.

7. The In-Charge Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre,  
Pandarak, District - Patna.

8. The Accountant General, Mahalekhakar Bhawan, Beerchand  
Patel Path, Patna, Bihar.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Pd. Singh, Adv.

For the State : Mr. Aditya Nath Jha, AC to SC-18

For the Respondent No.8 : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI  
SHARAN SINGH**

ORAL JUDGMENT & ORDER

**Date: 08-08-2016**

This writ application, under Article 226 of the  
Constitution of India, has been filed seeking direction to the  
respondents to pay the petitioner the interest on account of

delayed payment of pensionary benefits.

2. The petitioner retired as a Class-IV employee from Primary Health Centre, Pandarak, in the district of Patna, with effect from 31.12.1997.

3. Admittedly, his post-retiral dues have been cleared, but in the year 2014.

4. This is not in dispute that there is no provision of statutory interest payable for delay in payment of post-retiral dues including Pension and Gratuity. Further, from the pleadings on record, it appears that the petitioner was getting provisional pension after his retirement. There is vague statement in the writ application that the petitioner's provisional pension was also stopped. Nothing is stated as to since when the provisional pension of the petitioner was stopped.

5. In the facts and circumstance of the case, no case is made out requiring this Court to direct the respondents for payment of interest on post-retiral dues to the petitioner.

6. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

**(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)**

Praveen-II/-

|                   |           |
|-------------------|-----------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR      |
| CAV DATE          | N/A       |
| Uploading Date    | 10.8.2016 |
| Transmission Date | N/A       |