IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14610 of 2014

==

1. Jai Krishna Prasad S/o Late Girija Shankar Prasad Residence Pink House 402, Patliputra Residency Apartment, Anandpuri, West Boring Canal Road, P.S. S.K. Puri, Patna-800001 (Mob Phone No. 09304509427).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. The General Manager, State Bank of India (Pension),4th Floor, Judge's Court Road, Patna
4. The Assistant General Manager, Centralised Pension Processing Centre (04476), Administrative Office, Judges Court Road, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mahtab Alam, A.C. to S.C. 20.
For the S.B.I. : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh.

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-09-2016

Petitioner is a retired employee of the State of Bihar and is a practicing Advocate of this Court being member of the Advocate Association. He has been appearing in person in this case but today he is not present.

2. Learned counsel for the State and the State Bank of India are present. Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the Bank is on record. The only dispute in the present case emanates from the fact that upon superannuation of the petitioner in the year 1992 when the P.P.O. was drawn up by the Central Pension Processing Centre of the State Bank of India, by a typographical error the year of the date of birth of the petitioner was entered as 1932 instead of 1934. The

result was that calculating the date of birth as 1932, he became octogenarian in the year 2012. Accordingly, as per the pension scheme he became entitled to additional 10% pension in the year 2012. Upon this mistake, on notice corrections were made with the consent of the petitioner by the State Bank of India. The petitioner does not challenge this mistake as committed by the Central Pension Processing Centre, State Bank of India, Patna but his only grievance is that the excess payment received by him for the two years ought to be adjusted on a low monthly deduction basis instead of heavy deductions per month.

3. In the counter affidavit, letter of the petitioner has been brought on record agreeing with the deduction. The deductions have now been completed and pension restored because now he has become 80 years old even as per the correct year of date of birth i.e. 1934.

4. In view of the aforesaid, in my view keeping the writ petition pending will not serve any purpose. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

Amin/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	