

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14352 of 2013

=====

Ram Chandra Ram Son of Late Mauzi Ram resident of village - Sonma, Post
Office- Kothiya, Police Station- Didarganj, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Engineer, Public Health Engineering
Department, Government of Bihar
2. Executive Engineer, Public Health Mechanical Division, Vatnary College, Patna
3. Assistant Mechanical Engineer, Public Health Mechanical, Sub Division, Patna
East, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 28-04-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

In this case, a limited prayer has been made by the
petitioner to open the G.P.F. account with effect from 1980 and
make deduction accordingly.

The short fact of this case is that the petitioner was
appointed as a Pump Operator on 25.10.1980 as a daily wages
labourer. Time to time, the service of the petitioner was extended,
but some daily wages labourers moved before this Court in
C.W.J.C. No. 7359 of 2002 (Ram Tapeswar Sah and Ors. vs.
State of Bihar) and the Court directed for consideration the case of

the daily wages employees for the purposes of regularisation and opening of G.P.F. account.

The Chief Engineer (Mechanical), Public Health Mechanical Division, Govt. of Bihar issued a letter dated 28.11.2006, recommended for regularisation of large number of the daily wages employees, including the petitioner and ultimately, the petitioner was regularised in service by the order of Executive Engineer dated 29.11.2006. When the petitioner and others were not given the benefit of GPF scheme, some employees, who were regularised in service, filed C.W.J.C. No. 6183 of 2008 and there the Court allowed the writ application holding that they are covered under the GPF scheme and directed for opening of the account. Against the order of the Single Judge, an appeal was filed before Division Bench and ultimately the matter was finally settled in S.L.P. without any success. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner should be given the same benefit as has been given to the petitioner of C.W.J.C. No. 6183 of 2008 (Sheo Kumar Shukla Vs. State of Bihar).

The respondent authority will examine the case of the petitioner and if it is found that his case is also covered by the judgment, he will be given the same benefit as has been given the petitioner of C.W.J.C. No. 6183 of 2008. The whole process should

be completed within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

With the above observation/direction, this petition is disposed of.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	03/05/2016
Transmission Date	