

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19302 of 2015

=====

Sheo Chandra Prasad Singh son of Late Jai Narayan Singh resident of village-
Karmawari, P.S.- Paroo, District- Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Primary Education, Bihar, Patna
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Magistrate Muzaffarpur
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner-cum-Chairman, District Establishment Committee, Muzaffarpur
7. The District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur
8. The District Programme Officer, Establishment, Muzaffarpur
9. The Senior Deputy Collector-cum-Nodal Officer, Muzaffarpur

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-09-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and State.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court for the following
reliefs:

*“That, this writ application is being filed for
issuance of a writ/writs, order/s or direction/s in
the nature of mandamus for commanding the
concerned respondent authorities to fix the
pension in terms of revised pay scales of the
petitioner*

*And further for issuance of writ/writs, order/s or
direction/s for which the petitioner will be found*



entitled on the basis of the facts and circumstances of the case as elaborate and stated hereinafter.”

3. Upon hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that he was aggrieved with the fact that another person namely, Dhramnath Prasad Singh, who had joined and superannuated along with the petitioner, was being paid higher pension than the petitioner. From the counter affidavit, it appears that by order contained in Memo No. 3739 dated 28.07.2017, the authorities have rectified the anomaly and in fact now the petitioner has been held to be entitled to a higher amount compared to the said Dhramnath Prasad Singh.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that Dhramnath Prasad Singh has been paid earned leave for 263 days whereas the petitioner has been paid for 260 days. It was further submitted that there should be rectification in the amount of earned leave paid.

5. Having considered the matter, the Court finds that the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed. However, with regard to the difference of 3 days earned leave, the same is too meager an issue and is not required to be adjudicated.

6. However, if the petitioner feels that anything further



remains to be paid, he shall be entitled to make a detailed representation before the appropriate authority, who shall consider the same and pass a reasoned order.

7. The writ petition stands disposed off in the aforementioned terms.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

Anjani/-

AFR/NAFR	
U	

