

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18592 of 2016

=====

Jaynath Singh, son of Late Ram Janam Singh, resident of village and post-Jitaura,
P.S.-Piro, District- Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Principal Secretary, Development Department, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Vikas Bhawan, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director (Secondary Education), Department of Education, Bihar Secondary Education Office, Budh Marg, Patna.
4. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Patna Magadh Division, Patna.
5. The District Education Officer, Bhojpur.
6. The Treasury Officer, Bhojpur.
7. The General Provident Fund Officer, Bhojpur.
8. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Jai Prabhat Kishore, AC to SC-13
For the A.G. : Mr. Raghwanand, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 31-01-2017

Heard parties.

The petitioner claims that despite the direction contained in Annexure-1 issued by the Director, Secondary Education, Bihar Patna after the order passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court in CWJC No.21988 of 2014, no action has been taken for payment of his arrears of salary etc. since 1.01.1989 though a direction was given to the R.D.D.D, Patna Zone, Patna to make an enquiry with respect to the fact that the petitioner was working since 1.01.1989 or not and, thereafter, the District Education Officer, Bhojpur was directed to do the needful.



Learned counsel for the Accountant General has also submitted that no sanction order has been received by the Department till date.

Accordingly, this writ application is being disposed of with a direction to the respondent no.2 to examine the matter and if nothing has been done after the direction of the Director, Secondary Education, then responsibility should be fixed upon the erring person on whose action nothing has been paid. If the decision has already been taken then action would not be required. In case a decision has been taken in favour of the petitioner but no payment has been made till date, again responsibility should be fixed against the erring person. However, if the decision has been taken against the petitioner but the same has not been communicated to him then that should be done immediately.

If the petitioner is found entitled, necessary payment should be made within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

V.K. Pandey/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	02.02.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

